1980

Midwest China Oral History Interviews

Randolph Sailer

RANDOLPH SAILER

ORAL NARRATIVE ABSTRACT

BORN: August 24, 1898, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

EARLY BACKGROUND: family background; education; accepted as missionary by Presbyterian Board of Missions to teach psychology at Yenching University, 1923.

CHINA EXPERIENCES: trip to and early impressions of China; teaching responsibilities and description of courses; living conditions at Yenching; political attitudes of students and faculty at Yenching; Christian fellowships at Yenching; personal relationships at and outside of Yenching; response to Communists and Nationalists; changing social attitudes of students during 1930s; personal relationship with students; involvement with "radical" students at Yenching after WWII; response to John Leighton Stuart's ambassadorship; response to the issue of reparations for Yenching; the Communist takeover of Yenching, 1949; leaving the Yenching community and China, 1950; mistakenly denounced by Communists after departure from China; memorable Chinese and Westerners; description of mass baptism of 1000 Chinese soldiers; summary of experience and philosophy; description of 1973 trip to the PRC.

INTERVIEWER: Questions were submitted by Jane Baker Koons. Independent taping was then done in Sandy Spring, Maryland. After the initial taping was received, additional responses and clarifying statements were elicited.

DATE: 3-18-80

PLACE: Sandy Spring, Maryland NUMBER OF PAGES: 126

INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWER: Dr. Sailer, would you tell us when and where you were born and something of your family background?

SAILER: I was born in Philadelphia, August 24, 1898. My father was a Princeton graduate of 1889, where he was a very intimate friend of Robert E. Speer, a great religious leader of that time. My mother was a Quaker of the Clothier family, a rather wealthy family. Her father was one of the founders of Strawbridge & Clothier Department Stores. My father had had a very profound religious experience in college, in which he became extremely enthusiastic about Christian missionaries overseas, and he gave his life to that.

In 1903 or 1904, we moved over to Englewood, New Jersey, to be very near Mr. Speer and for my father to work at the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. He had inherited enough money that he never needed to work to earn money, so he gave his services as honorary education advisor to the Board.

Mother, as I said, was a Quaker, and she went along with anything Father did--although she was very much of a person in her own right. Father would have liked to have gone as a missionary, but he was the only son of a widowed mother and decided that he should not go for that reason. His life work was missionary education in this country as a volunteer.

I: What is your own educational background?

SAILER: My last two years of high school, I went to the Hotchkiss School in Connecticut. Henry Luce (Harry) was the year after me and I knew him somewhat then. His father had been in our home in Englewood and was quite a friend of my father.

I was Princeton class of 1919. I had very strong pacifist tendencies, but was rather weak-kneed and finally decided to accept the draft at the end, not losing any college time. After that I taught a year at Hampton Institute in Virginia. My father very much stressed practical education and wanted me to go to Teachers College, which greatly emphasized the practical in education, rather than the classical.

I am sorry now that I did not really get a certain kind of good, hard education, including the classical, though I do value what I did get. One of my most valuable experiences was being a counselor at the Princeton Summer Camp in Bayhead, New Jersey, which was run for underprivileged boys from Philadelphia and New York. I still have lifelong friends from that camp. A fellow counselor was Henry Pitt Van Dusen, the late president of Union Theological Seminary. We were lifelong friends. I took a routine M.A. from Teachers College. Then, on furlough, I came back 1929-1930 and obtained a Ph.D. (granted in 1931) in educational psychology. It was my father's great interest in missions that then led me to interest in China. He saw the tremendous possibilities of the Chinese people and had us children read many books on the subject. My older sister, Josephine, went as a missionary to China in 1921, but she returned because of ill health a couple of years later and then went out again, after she married Henry Welles. It was certainly my father who was the tremendous influence on me as to China, although I reacted against him in some other ways.

I: How did this reaction affect you?

SAILER: I did not react against my father's very deep interest and concern with China or his wanting me to go there or his wanting me to go into educational work. He did not think primarily, nor did I, in terms of saving souls but of working in a very great civilization with tremendous possibilities. My reactions against him, I think, were more along the lines of his tendency to divide people into good and bad guys--to be very sure of his particular beliefs and to be pretty impatient with others.

I think he made a very great contribution to so-called mission education in this country. He was always a person for getting the background of the people studied. He would often role-play to try to bring out the attitudes of people as he understood them. On the other hand, I don't think he was very naturally sensitive to the feelings and viewpoints of other people because he was so deeply convinced of his own.

I: How was a China interest stimulated during your Princeton years?

SAILER: At Princeton I carried on my interest in China. There was a Mr. Teng there, a Chinese student with whom I was very friendly, at the Princeton Summer Camp; although he died tragically, within a year after that. I remember Dwight Edwards coming and meeting our Student Volunteer group. There were other China contacts, but this was after my own interest had developed. I was not a part of the Princeton-in-Peking Program, but I had always heard about it and my father was on their board of trustees or managers for many years and took a very great interest in it.

In Peking, my wife, Louise, and I were very closely associated with the Princeton-in-Peking people. Larry Sears was one of my best friends in Princeton and he went out as a short-termer and stayed till 1927. There were others as well.

I: Did you have other contacts with China Hands before you arrived?

SAILER: I had not so much contact with people who worked in China before I went out, but Dr. Leighton Stuart came to our home and invited me to join the faculty of Yenching. He said that they needed psychology more than education. Since specialties were not very highly developed at that time, I sort of moved over in my preparation toward psychology and stressed that a little more. Educational psychology had been my main interest and I never moved back into education until just the last couple of years I was in China.

I: Why did Leighton Stuart feel that they needed more psychology than education at this time at Yenching?

SAILER: This was simply, I think, because education had Dr. Galt, one of the very leading members of the faculty at its head, and they were anxious to develop psychology. The idea was that after two or three years they would get someone else in psychology and I would go over to education. Actually, I stayed in psychology into the late 40s.

I: What impressions did you have of China before you arrived?

SAILER: My impressions of China were a tremendously significant country with a very able people, but very backward in many ways. The idea of their needing help appealed to me

strongly. America had so many doctors. China had so few. Education in China was so much less developed than in America. The idea of training leadership was the great thing. I thought more in those terms, I think, than in strictly religious terms--or, I could say, that is how my religious faith wanted to express itself.

I: How were the arrangements made for you to go to Yenching under the Presbyterian Board?

SAILER: In the Northfield Conference--just before I entered Princeton--I became a Student Volunteer with China foremost in mind. It was natural for me to turn to the Presbyterian Board: Mr. Speer was the senior secretary of that board, and my father worked in connection with that board. All my contacts were there. When I came up for review, there was an older gentleman, a Mr. Reed, who was somewhat doubtful about my theology. But, still I was passed and accepted to go out in 1923.

The arrangement to go to Yenching was really due to Leighton Stuart, who allowed me to fill one place in the quota that the Presbyterians set. It was not really a decision of the Board, but it was accepted by the Board, so I was very happy and took that as what I really wanted to do.

I: What were Mr. Reed's doubts?

SAILER: Dr. Reed was, as I recall, a very fine, gentle fundamentalist. It was perfectly natural for him to be doubtful about my theology.

I: Do you recall what expectations you had before leaving for China?

SAILER: When I think of it, it is awfully hard to go back and see just what my expectations were. I think that I had very great interest in the general progress of China, and Christianization would be a part of that. I don't think before I went there that I expected to become so very deeply interested in the student movement and politics in China. I don't even remember how much I knew of the May Fourth Movement of 1919, which really showed the power of students in China. But I very soon learned about that and felt that Chinese students were simply great.

I went at the language in just the wrong way. I learned the meanings--not the pronunciation or anything else and not the use--of about 2,000 Chinese characters. I learned the radicals before I went, and I did not go at the language from the spoken end, but through the eye. I had been very dumb by not learning through the ear. If I were to do it again, I would certainly try to get a grasp of the spoken language in the beginning. Yet, language teaching at the Peking Language School was supposed to be very advanced for that time, but I would have a different way of teaching language now if I were running a language school.

I: Would you describe your journey en route to China?

SAILER: I guess I knew more than the average person about China before I went there. I traveled in China with a man who is now my very best friend in all the world, Dick Ritter. He was two years ahead of me in college and a perfectly marvelous guy. Paul Bushnell, who later died, was with us. We three went out and we arrived in Yokohama the day after the terrible earthquake in September of 1923.

We were not able to stop there in Yokohama and went over to Kobe. We spent a couple of days with friends of Dick Ritter there. He had marvelous friends all over the world. We saw a little bit of Japan and then went on to Peking. I remember being very conscious of wanting to live simply, if possible, and to Dick and Paul's disgust, I sat up all night, second class, in the train on the way down from Mukden (now Shenyang). When we arrived at the station, I insisted on carrying my own luggage, although Dick said I would lose face by doing that. However, I did ride in a ricksha up to the Presbyterian mission, four miles away. I arrived in China, then, about September 17, 1923, and went to live with a family in the Presbyterian mission.

This family--I think they were very fine people--but they did not appeal to me in their attitudes. For example, one thing that they were complaining about was that their next door neighbor, William Gleysteen, had actually kept the door open between Truth Hall School, in the back and the front of our compound, and the Chinese crossed every day. That was sort of an insult to us foreigners who were supposed to want to get away from Chinese.

I was initially assigned and went to Yenching the next year to live with an old theological professor, a Britisher, who never received Chinese in his front door, but always had them come in a side door. Well, I don't know what would have happened if I had actually lived with him. I would have exploded someway. But mercifully, for me, he died and I never did live with him.

I: What were your initial impressions of China and the Chinese?

SAILER: I wish I had much more in me of an ability to understand and appreciate all things the Chinese appreciated: the art and the niceties of the art and the wonderful places of Peking. I did visit them, but I was too single-minded and simple-minded, really, to become an expert in any of them and I regret that. I wish that I'd spent a lot of time just bargaining on street corners. But I did not like to bargain and I did not like to buy many things as I am not a collector.

Yenching University was considered "ultra-liberal" by our local mission. A grand old man of the mission made a very heavy attack on it at our first mission meeting, and then was answered very effectively, it seemed to me, by one of our professors, Charlie Corbett, from Yenching. But the feeling was that Yenching was really not a Christian institution. I felt very, very differently. I revered Leighton Stuart from the start and I did not think of Christian work in the terms accepted by some of the mission people.

To many missionaries and Christians at home, it was considered a sine qua non that a Christian institution should have required chapel attendance and required Bible study, though it seemed evident when the Nationalist government took over that would not be allowed. Yenching gave them up voluntarily in 1924 or '25 to the satisfaction of almost all of us. Very few attended chapel or took courses in religion after that, but the general spirit and attitude toward the Christian faith seemed better. When the requirement was made by the government, most Christian colleges and lower schools accepted it reluctantly.

Some years later, there was a conference of the Board at Lakeville in which they sent out word that they were worried that missionaries were not really taking the Christian part of their work seriously enough. We were asked to put down exactly what amount of time we gave each day to specifically Christian work. I felt that these were not the terms in which I thought and I simply refused to do it. I was told that the Presbyterian mission had reported back to the Board and that they sort of washed their hands of me. They were very, very nice people, but they didn't feel that they could take responsibility for such an attitude as that. I was certainly not the only one. I know that William Adolph (of the Board) was much sharper in saying that he thought that that kind of thing was nonsense.

I: Exactly what was your relationship with the Presbyterian Board during your years in China? Were you always under the auspices of the Board?

SAILER: I always had very deep respect for our Presbyterian Board of Missions headed by Dr. Speer, whom I revered as a person even though neither my father nor I could share his particular theological emphasis. I was always under the auspices of the Board. They tended to support their representatives, to trust them in anything that they did. At the same time they realized that there were very great differences among missionaries themselves. Some of them went out with evangelistic fervor to save souls from hell. Others went out with the type of feeling of a great nation that they wanted to work with in order to help in educational, medical and perhaps other ways.

Mr. Speer himself, I found, had a main emphasis on evangelism. I think he looked on education or medicine not as ends in themselves, but as means to evangelization. I don't think Yenching was his favorite institution in spite of his own daughter working there. But the Board was tolerant. It supported Yenching. I was a poor missionary speaker. When I came home, I did not give the kind of message that was most welcome. This thing gets into a sort of a circle. The kind of people who would join missionary societies and would come to listen to missionary speeches tended to be those who thought in the more conventional missionary terms. I found myself when I spoke sometimes I was not satisfying to the people I would talk to. I was not a vivid speaker in any case.

I: You mentioned learning the language. What relationships developed among your fellow language school students?

SAILER: During language school, I lived up at the Presbyterian mission and didn't live at the language school or bum around the language school people, although some of my fellow students there I got to know very well. In the spring, I decided that it would be better to go off in the country. Paul Bushnell and I went off together and got a little taste of country life, but I wasn't very good at that. I took a trip out to the Eastern Tombs with Henry Fenn; it was then in midwinter. The next summer we had a month off and we went up to Dolanor. There were nine of us on a mule train and we camped. But this really was "foreigners in China." It really wasn't getting in with Chinese and we didn't talk Chinese on the way. Henry's Chinese was perfect--he was born there--but it was simply a vacation as far as I was concerned and seeing something of the country.

I: What were your initial responsibilities at Yenching?

SAILER: As far as my work was concerned, I was told what classes I would be expected to teach and given some latitude in that. We instructors, mainly I, wrote a little text book for an elementary psychology course that all students took. One of my early experiences was when Dr. Stuart simply took me to a wedding, uninvited. He said, "Oh, come along. It is quite all right." That was the wedding of Philip Fu Ching-po, who was really his adopted son--became his secretary later on. Philip and Sara were married there in Peking and I had the experience of the Chinese wedding at a restaurant. (Philip has now become a very dear friend and I visit him often in the city here.)

We had various lectures at the language school on Chinese culture. I remember old Dr. Smith, Arthur Smith, but I really don't remember getting any great insight into Chinese society and culture.

My responsibilities were really teaching, but outside of that, what I really liked to do was to get to know students out of class. I took trips with them out to the country sometimes, although we did so much more of that after we went out to the new campus three years later.

I think that I was sloppy in my teaching. I was not really well-trained in psychology and I was always trying to rouse discussion and make the work practical and meaningful to students. I just didn't do it very well. I think if I had the teaching to do over again, I could do it very, very much better. It gave me time to do a great deal of reading in psychology and I did develop. But there again, I tended to read quite widely and maybe rather sloppily and did not become a respectable psychologist.

I: Specifically, how were you trying to make your psychology classes practical and meaningful to the students?

SAILER: Specifically, I was really failing. I did encourage discussion. I tried to relate our material as well as I could to what students were interested in. I did not do what some teachers did, simply get off the subject entirely and say, "Now we'll discuss current events." I think that if we brought in current events, and we didn't do that alone, it was in relation to the psychology we were discussing.

One of my courses, anyway, was very popular and I had a great deal of student contacts through it. This course had the unappetizing title of Mental Hygiene. I really didn't start it--Helen Sweet, a fellow YMCA missionary, had developed it when I was on furlough in 1929-1930. Then I took it up from there. That was really a course in which I had large numbers of students. Psychology did not have a vocational outlet in China, and I really wish that I had been able to move over into education.

I: What was the course substance of Mental Hygiene? Why was it such a popular class?

SAILER: I wish I had the textbook that I gradually worked out and printed myself containing the great many questions that were developed during the course. I had three editions of that: two of them printed; the first one mimeographed. I used to give, generally speaking, two lectures to what might be quite a large group. For the third hour we always broke up into discussion groups of not more than eight or ten students, where we could really interact. I think students felt that was valuable. Then I would have each student write a paper and would have an individual interview with him or her. I think students felt that I had a warm interest in them personally. Discussion of personality is always likely to have interest for people, even though my background of the real understanding of the differences in culture was very superficial.

In psychology, however, I had the tremendous advantage of association with Dr. Luh Chih-wei (C.W. Luh), who was a man I very, very deeply admired, and at the same time, got annoyed at in certain ways.

I: What annoyed you?

SAILER: I felt sometimes that Dr. Luh was too hard on the administration. Instead of trying to work out ways with them, he would fight for what he wanted. Also, I just was so sorry that he concentrated on the kind of psychology that was being studied in the West--rat psychology. I think he and certain other Chinese psychologists were eager to be in the mainstream of psychology and he certainly was. But there was such a wonderful chance for cultural and social psychology in the broadest sense, anthropology, the understanding of cultures. He had such a very wonderful background for that and such a great keenness of mind that to have him let me fumble along these lines made me feel very annoyed. I wish that I could have really exploited my contacts with him much more fully. I think that he felt that the kind of thing I tended to teach, except for some statistics, was very, oh, superficial and almost indecent. But he was a wonderful and a tolerant friend.

He later became chancellor of the university. He taught general psychology and did it very, very well and was extremely popular and influential. I taught this quite basic course in personality, mental hygiene. Then I was really most interested in social psychology and gave a variety of other courses that had social applications: Psychological Aspects of Journalism, Politics, and so forth.

I: What kind of student response did you have to those classes like Psychological Aspects of Journalism, Politics, and so forth?

SAILER: I am sure some of them felt that it was extremely thin and practically contentless. On the other hand, I think in general the students were interested in anything in their own fields and in other aspects of their field. At least, I had enough response so that these courses were respectably elected.

I: What was your living situation at Yenching?

SAILER: My first year I lived rather accidentally with a wonderful Britisher, E. J. Bentley. Dick Ritter came up from Shanghai--he'd been in Shanghai for one year--and joined us there and we three were together. They made me housekeeper, at which I was totally incompetent, but when ever I offered to resign (as I often did), I was unanimously re-elected because no one else wanted to take on the job. We three lived in bachelor quarters there in the old first court at Yenching. When I was married, my wife and I lived for a year in a little, tiny place off Dr. Galt's house, sort of a gateman's residence, and then we moved out in 1926 to the wonderful new campus.

My mother wanted to give us a regular foreign house out there on the new campus. In fact, she paid for one, but we never occupied it because we wanted a Chinese house. After we came back from our furlough in 1929, Mother gave us more money toward a new house that was our Chinese house on campus. We lived there until the time of the Japanese war. (After that I think it was used by the university doctor, as it was near the men's infirmary.) We came back to live on the south compound in one of the foreign houses for our last three years in China.

I: What was the response of the Chinese and western faculty to your living in a Chinese house?

SAILER: Oh, I don't think anything very special. I think that one or two other Westerners sort of preferred that, too. Some of them did live in Chinese houses; they were assigned there. I don't think it was any big deal. My mother gave us one of the ordinary foreign houses as a wedding present, but we never lived in it because we preferred to live in a Chinese house. Then she gave us money toward a second Chinese house. In our last years we didn't really think in those terms. When our Chinese house was not available, after the war, we moved to one of the western houses in the south compound without thinking very much about it.

We had the usual servants: Our children were born there. Our old cook, when we went back in 1973, was in the group that met us at the campus and was an honored guest at dinners given for us. He was then in charge of the foreign hostel for visiting foreigners on the campus. We lived with his cooking again, though we asked him to give us Chinese food.

We always tried, in a way, to live simply. We always had that on our consciences, but actually we lived very much as other foreigners did. We never tried to own a home at Peitaho, the summer resort. One year we lived in a little tiny place, partly with a tent. Then other times at Peitaho, we rented. I tried never to take more than a month off. In Peking, I did a great deal of working with admissions there. I threw myself into that and maybe let the family down by not spending more time at Peitaho.

The theory of Yenching was to bring the Chinese to the level of foreigners, rather than to ask foreigners to live more on the level of Chinese. Foreigners differed

in their opinions on housing. Some of them thought they wanted to live in Chinese houses. One Chinese colleague said that he would prefer to live in a Chinese house. But he sort of felt it was his duty to take a big foreign house to demonstrate that Chinese and Westerners lived equally, and he did so. I think, afterward, when the Communists came in, some of the feelings of Chinese really came out. When inflation came, our salaries were protected. At one time we were able to turn back a quarter of our salary to the university. The Chinese suffered a great deal with inflation, even though Yenching was much better than the governmental institutions where the professors hardly ever got paid at all. I think they tended, some of them, to resent American standards, although some lived right up to them and they always entertained more lavishly than we did. They knew how to do it. Chinese are marvelous on hospitality.

I: You mentioned that at one time you gave back a quarter of your salary to Yenching. How common was this among western faculty? How did you decide to do it?

SAILER: I am not aware that other faculty happened to do it. We had guilty consciences to be receiving so much more at the time than our Chinese friends. We had family financial backing. I have sort of always felt overprivileged. We were making no sacrifice. I decided that there was a chance where we could make a little gesture. I don't know whether anybody knew about it but Leighton Stuart.

One problem was that we missionaries within the Presbyterian Board received exactly the same salary from the time we went out. I think, maybe after 20 years or something, there was an increase of $60.00 or something like that. I

don't remember what the point of that was. A family with children received children's allowances and more than a single missionary, or a couple without children. There was no differentiation in grade as it was supposed to be paid on the Communist principle: to each according to his need. The Chinese faculty, on the other hand, were paid according to Chinese custom, with very little salary for the lower grades and then going up as they got higher. The top Chinese salaries, at least for most of the time I think, were above the top foreign salaries, but the average Chinese was much lower.

I: What were your wife's involvements before and after your marriage?

SAILER: Louise was second in her class at Smith--a very brilliant student. She stood much higher than I did in college. She came out to China to work independently in the women's college connected with Yenching. She and I were both interested in students. She was very, very good in her personal relationships. On the other hand, I think I was not a very good husband. I was not as expressive as I should have been. I was more matter-of-fact. I think she always felt a certain kind of rivalry between my interest in students and in my work and my concern for the family.

Also, in additon to that, was the psychological climate of the time--J.B. Watson and his conception of "too much mother love." I certainly didn't fall for that completely, but I was influenced by his great emphasis on the independence of children. And this tied in with some reaction against my father's tremendous concern. He would like to have known every thought that we had and to steer it right. I reacted against that and wanted to give my children as much independence as possible and thought that they would flourish under it and prefer that. I did not realize that

I should have given them much more support, that we should have talked things over individually and as a family much more closely. In that respect, I was by no means a good father.

At the present time, my oldest and youngest sons have only, I would say, quite slight interest in China. To my second son it means a great deal. He is very active as a vice-president of the National Committee of the U.S.-China Relationships. He has gone far beyond me. He has a wonderful command of the spoken language and has made several trips to China. He has a very deep and abiding concern for China for which I am extremely grateful.

Louise took great interest in embroidery work, helping village women. She worked with other women in that. She was a wonderful hostess in our home. She taught in the School of Religion. Her subject was religious education. I think Yenching students spoke of her very warmly, those who knew her, and a great many did know her because of the amount of our home involvement.

I: Would you describe the students that you began teaching in the 1920s? What were their moods, the goals, interests and concerns at this time?

SAILER: The Chinese tremendously value education. We had students at Yenching who were very hard up, could hardly continue in college. I remember one man, one very good friend of mine and one of the very few psychology majors, came to me and asked if I would help him through college. I finally decided to do it, although he didn't seem to be a brilliant student and I wondered if he had a real future. We became very close friends.

Later on he earned some money in biology, took up biological study, and became a distinguished professor. He came to America and then became head of an institution in Chengtu, where he now is. He has been sort of a lifelong friend; he was a man of very great strength. He came back to Yenching and taught there at times. It is an illustration of a country boy, quite simple at first but with great determination, who then uncovered very great ability.

As far as I can remember, students, many students, were deeply interested in their country and doing something about it. This period of the warlords was extremely discouraging. It looked as though it would be one warlord after the other, working for their own interest, and with foreign powers meddling in and throwing their weight around in China.

One of the first issues that came up was the issue of extraterritoriality in China. The Yenching faculty were leading Chinese faculty who had standing throughout the country. With their leadership and with the very warm support of most of the foreigners (but not all), we came out with a statement denouncing extraterritoriality from the Yenching faculty. Many other missionaries took quite a dim view of that. That was considered quite an unorthodox thing to do, and, to some extent, both meddling in politics and perhaps being somewhat disloyal to our own country. So the gap between students and faculty was certainly very far from complete.

I think during the year 1924-'25, which was my first year actually living down at the university in K'uei Chia Ch'ang, the old site, there was the issue of the Taku Forts down below Tientsin. The Chinese were extremely

indignant at the foreign powers for using military force to keep the Tientsin River open. I think that was sort of the first student eruption and strike since May 4, 1919. I think we had some kind of student strike every year that I was at Yenching. Faculty might sympathize, but in general urged students to come back to class.

The next year was the famous May 25th Incident in Shanghai in which students were killed--and our students, and all the universities, simply erupted at that time. I remember standing on Hataman Street near the YMCA when a group of students marched by yelling, "Sha, Sha, Sha," which means "kill." But one of the students (whom I happened to know as I'd met him at another university and taught him in the YMCA English a little bit) came and started apologizing. He said, "Oh! We didn't mean you." The patriotic interest was very high. I think many of our faculty sympathized with it right at that time and felt that foreign imperialism was, or whatever you want to call it, really very bad. And they wanted to get that foreign interest out of China and wanted to see Chinese nationalism arise.

In those early days of student strikes, it would often take the form of being "anti" a particular dean or administrative officer at Yenching, perhaps with certain faculty rivalries involved. The dean of the women's college, Mrs. Murray S. Frame, was very heavily attacked some time after we moved out to the new site, and, I think, unfairly so.

I: Why was Mrs. Frame attacked?

SAILER: Mrs. Frame was partly attacked because, I think, of her endeavor to chaperone the women college students, to enforce fairly strict rules. Whereas Chinese boys would naturally have preferred more open dormitories. I think that entered in on the attack on her. She was a very strong person. She would try to preserve academic standards. She was sort of fighting for the women's college.

I don't know how much this student striking was mixed up with other things besides politics. Of course, many faculty felt that this was a way to get out of examinations. There was probably some element of that. I think there almost surely was. These strikes were likely to come when the examinations were about to come round.

At the same time, I think students were sincere, to a certain extent, in saying they were willing to sacrifice their education for the country. Now that would have been a pure joke in America. Students here seem usually willing to sacrifice their education lightheartedly. In China, education was their way of life in a sense that it was not in America. When they really went out on strike, they felt that they were sacrificing something.

On the other hand, we faculty people tended to think that it was much more important for them to prepare for the future than to strike at that time. Looking back on it, I am not at all sure that that was true. I think that they got political experience and a kind of discipline that helped to make the new China. It is very hard for us Americans to think of students as anything more than rather immature kids whose main duty was to prepare for the future. In China, students <u>were</u> the future. They were very influential and had been since 1919--the May Fourth Incident--in controlling the affairs of the country. This was a fact that was hard for us to get used to.

We would have, then, endless discussions in our home or invite to meals certain students. Personally, I was one of those faculty members who tended to be very sympathetic with the radical students. They really seemed to mean business and be willing to sacrifice for their country. They worked very hard; they had a dedication that I didn't feel that some of our students had.

These other students were very fine, very attractive, but tended to be more interested in the social life of the institution. I think that some faculty members (I wouldn't say just how many because this is all on a continuum) would naturally mistrust radical students; "radical" had a bad connotation in America. They would naturally find that if a student came around to them, perhaps visited in their home and said that he or she disapproved of this radical movement, they would feel that here was your really sane student. We found it easier to have contacts with radical students, but this was all a matter of degree. I don't think we split sharply into a radical faculty and conservative faculty.

I: You mentioned what happened as a reaction to the May 25th Incident. What other expressions of anti-foreign sentiment did you experience in the late 20s?

SAILER: When I first reached China in 1923, I went out for a walk with an older missionary, a very humorous guy, Roy Johnson. A little boy yelled out something at us which I didn't catch; I was just beginning on the language. Roy said that the little boy had just called us "foreign devils." Roy had replied humorously that he wasn't very well brought up by his parents to use such kind of language. The kid was a little abashed because that was the proper way for Roy to have answered in that case. He did it in good humor.

This was the year after the first (1922) real wave of anti-foreign sentiment occurred. Bertrand Russell had been to China. John Dewey, also, but Bertrand Russell was especially outspoken. I think there had been a conference, a sort of anti-Christian conference at Tsinghua University.

There was a good deal of resentment, very naturally, of a great big book gotten out by some of the mission boards called The Christian Occupation of China. I think we Christians tended to think in those terms of getting missionaries everywhere and the Chinese culturally disliked that, rejected it. Personally, all the time I was in China, I did not find anything unpleasant that I can think of now on the part of students just because I was a foreigner.

What rather amazed me was, in spite of the fact that there were these anti-foreign demonstrations against foreigners in general, they always said, "Oh, we don't mean you." What amazed me as well was the intensity of the anti-British sentiment all through the years, all through the 30s. I felt very close to the British. We had some of them on the faculty. Our finest faculty member, from the standpoint of understanding the Chinese revolutionary movement, was Ralph Lapwood--a Britisher. Yet, in general, the British were the ones that were considered the super-imperialists. The Americans were accepted, more or less, as friends.

After the Second World War, that feeling changed dramatically. Suddenly America became the great imperialist nation. It seems to me very clear that the reason for this was that all through the previous decade, Britain had been the country trying to throw her weight around--around the world. After the Second World War, America took her place as the country that was trying to run the world and she naturally inherited this pretty intense hostility.

I think, when there were protests against faculty in general on the part of the students, and they wanted to get out of classes, we faculty members took our own teaching

in a little more seriously than maybe the students did. We felt they must get their education, their valuable education which we were giving them. Students may have, and did somethings, become quite anti-faculty in general. But I think that there was no special distinction between foreign and Chinese faculty in that regard.

I: What consideration did the Yenching faculty give to leaving in the exodus of 1927?

SAILER: I don't remember more than one Yenching faculty member leaving in 1927 because of the situation and there may have been other reasons also then. I know a number of missionaries throughout the country did. Certainly the number of our YMCA group in Peking was very markedly reduced. But in Yenching we had, one may say, a protected environment. We were known as rather liberal on the whole and we felt very happy there. I don't think '27 made any special difference. We were apprehensive as to what might happen.

In the summer of 1927, Leighton Stuart felt it would be just as well if the wives and children got out of the city. Our family went to Senchun in Korea and I went over to spend about three weeks with them there. Actually, when Yen Hsi-shan troops (not Chiang Kai-shek's troops) came into Peking,it was very smooth; nothing special happened at all. Things went right on very much as before. The Nationalist government never had really confirmed control over Peking all through those years and students were in a relatively protected position there.

I: During the 1920s, how were the Yenching students responding to Christianity? How did this change in the '30s and '40s?

SAILER: We Americans, all my years in China, thought in terms of becoming a Christian as a clean-cut thing: either you were a Christian or you were not, and the sign of accepting the Christian faith was baptism. We had very few baptisms at Yenching, but there were some. But, in general, many Chinese students did not distinguish clearly as to whether they were Christians or not. When they entered, they were supposed to put their religion down on the admissions blank. Once in a while, somebody would say Confucian. Once in a great while somebody would put down Buddhist, but about a quarter of the students would say Christian. The rest would say no religion. I think that was rather typical, but it did not show any sharp division between that quarter of Christian students and the three quarters who did not consider themselves as that. Some of the students would come to services, but Chinese don't think in terms of service. You don't have Sunday morning services or any other morning services at the temple. You go off and it is a place of spiritual renewal, perhaps, but not a regular observance.

TAPE TWO-SIDE TWO

The Ritters, whom I have mentioned before, formed a fellowship group in their house. I think maybe that was all Christian students. They had some very fine students in it, including some of our very best friends. They had a great deal of interest in students doing self-help things and not only receiving. In that group they used to dust the Ritters' books or do little things about the house--which was sort of contrary to Chinese custom, but was accepted.

But the idea of the fellowship group spread, spread tremendously all over campus especially from 1938 on to 1941 when Japanese were in control of Peking. At one time there

were something like two-thirds or maybe three-fourths of the entire student body who were in these groups, meeting mostly around at faculty houses. We had a group in our house which we did not organize. One of our student friends asked if they could meet there. They called themselves "Friends of Jesus"-- Yeh Su Chih Yu. Sometimes they had worship services, but mostly they had discussions. They had games and just enjoyed themselves. Then we would serve them refreshments. It seemed to mean a great deal in student life.

These people also considered themselves members of the Christian fellowship even though most were not Christians. They were friendly toward Christianity and this seemed to be their form of expression of faith. They didn't think of baptism, a great majority of them, and they didn't draw a sharp distinction.

I: How were faculty and students involved in demonstrating the worth of Christianity and its relevance to China?

SAILER: Since the days of Sherwood Eddy, who conducted great evangelistic campaigns in China, there had been great emphasis on the Christian faith as a means of saving China. Dr. Y.P. Mei, one of my very admired colleagues, said that that was what brought him in middle school toward the Christian faith. This was the means of dedicating himself, not just to a certain belief, not just to a certain person or way of life, but to join in the crusade for a greater and finer China.

Students often thought in terms of service, but I don't remember that there was any great distinction between service as expressed by Christian fellowship people and those expressed by other students. They might set up little

schools in the nearby villages to keep teaching the children, or do other service projects. Many faculty women conducted kung ch'anhs--workshops. They were embroidery groups to give employment to the Manchu women, especially in the village right next to us. This was a bannermen village. The men were totally unemployed when the Empress Dowager went out. Some of the women could embroider very well. Some of the faculty women, foreigners mainly, organized these women into sewing groups so that they could help support themselves. The American women found an outlet for the sales of their projects in America. Louise was very active in this.

I don't think students were involved to any real extent in that particular service project, but the Christian faith was felt as a faith of service and of caring for other people. To some--to Chinese in general, I think--service meant identifying yourself with the poor of the country and really being willing to live simply yourself and to work toward the kind of society that later became the Communist society.

I suppose the student very closest to us all through the years was a man named Chang. (Incidentally, I just got a letter from him after 30 years, saying that he had looked up our address. When we were in China in 1973, he'd seen us on television and heard on radio that we were visiting China at that time, but he did not feel free to write to us. A wonderful letter in renewing the old ties.) This man (he was a psychology major) and I had very intimate contact with each other. He felt very strongly the urge to live simply. He went off and worked in a workshop of Sam Dean, a mission colleague of mine who at that time had no use for students. He thought they were entirely too high-hat and above the idea of doing any work.

Chang learned to use a spinning wheel and he was very patient and persistent at it. Then he got a group of students that he took on a camping trip, in which they did their own work; they didn't look toward servants at all. This was in contrast with the ordinary Chinese tradition. He had a very deep feeling of this. I had heard that he had later gotten in trouble in China and was looked on as a rightist, but I don't know the story of that. He married a very fine Christian girl. His wedding, which was held in the president's house, was very, very simple. We had some cookies, I think, that being about all, and he did this out of deep conviction.

Some of the student Christians, then, felt that the main expression of faith was to throw themselves into the struggle of national salvation. Others, I think, thought in more ordinary American terms, in terms of Bible study, and so on. We had some very dedicated students of that type, too. One man, Jimmy Liu, was tortured horribly by the Japanese and later went into the School of Religion. He had very strong social interest, too. He struggled over the question of how far he could throw himself in with the new Communist government and still stick by his very deep Christian faith.

One of the movements among the students was the Oxford Group, which was pushed by Ralph Lapwood; and Ralph deeply affected the lives of many students through the Oxford Group, some of the very leading ones. Later, Ralph himself fell away from the Oxford Group because he felt that it was sort of an elitist organization that tended to stay in swell hotels and did not have the social passion that Ralph himself had and that he wanted other students to have.

One of Ralph's men was the head of student government out in Chengtu when I was out there. He was one of the finest people I have ever known. Actually, he at one time was going to volunteer to serve a prison term of an indefinite length for someone who had been wrongly imprisoned. He was that type. He went out actually expecting to do it, but it didn't work out. I forgot for what reason. He came back to Yenching and was there at the time of the turnover. I remember him saying when he came back from a stay in the villages with his eyes shining: "Oh, these peasants have so much to teach us. They can do so much more effective work that is real work than we intellectuals." I think that is the spirit that some students did not catch at all.

I: What did the Oxford Group introduce that had such an impact on the students?

SAILER: I think Ralph Lapwood's commanding ability, personality, vital Christian faith and deep concerns were central. Also the Oxford Group appealed strongly to leading students in both China and America because of its challenge to complete idealism and devotion based on absolute honesty and love. I don't think sex entered into it in China to the extent that it did in America. Anyway, the warm fellowship of the Oxford Group, Ralph's personality, and the personalities of the young Swiss couple who were with him, naturally had a big impact as long as he was with them. The group in China had great social interest. When Ralph felt that the group in the West was lacking in that, he himself became pretty much an alumnus.

I: What did your students feel about their roles as intellectuals?

SAILER: Through the years, the general attitude of students was that as intellectuals they were naturally leaders, deserved to be leaders; the common people needed their guidance. I remember one of my American colleagues, a more conservative teacher, was saying about students who were always complaining against the government: Why didn't they get out and do non-governmental service as we would in America? It gradually came on me that students in China felt that the agent of social change must be the government. They might be "anti" a particular government, but they were not anti-government in general. They felt, "If we can only take over the government, then we will have a real chance to serve." One of our faculty members actually became a county magistrate and an official because he felt that was his best means of service. That was rather typically Chinese.

I: During the year you were chairman of the Yenta Fellowship (and other years as well), what were the critical issues that were being discussed?

SAILER: I don't remember any special characteristics of the fellowship the year that I happened to be chairman or that I initiated any new policies. Active discussions were going on throughout Yenching as to the relation of the Christian faith. During those years, we had students going out to Yenan to join the Communists. One of the most notable was the present foreign minister of China, Huang Hua (in those days Wang Ju Mei), and he was a very strong student leader.

Wang Ju Mei was a man who, when he looked at and talked to you, you would admire. He had a great strength about him. He was imprisoned by the government for maybe a couple of

months, and then he was released again and came back to Yenching. When he came back, there was a great outpouring of students to welcome him. I just happen to remember one student remarking that if the government had realized what a "big fish" they had caught, they would never have let him go. A few of our other students were arrested in demonstrations and imprisoned, but not many. Wang was outstanding.

I: Why was the Yenta Fellowship at one time "hailed as a model of the indigenous church?"

SAILER: I myself don't remember the fellowship spoken of as the model of the indigenous church. But if it was, it was because, I think, it represented international fellowship. It represented, in general, deep concern with the country's needs and it represented sort of an aspiration, a recognition that there was a God, even though some of those students may have considered themselves atheists. There was a very deep and important significance to life. I don't think that certainly many of them, when they made the transition to the Communist faith, it was not a complete transition, a complete giving up of the Christian faith and acceptance of the Communist faith.

Actually, those two faiths, along with Islam, are the great missionary faiths of the world that demand and insist on an exclusive loyalty. Chinese do not think in those terms nearly as much as we do. Many Christians would like to have become ardent party members and some did so. But the party policy was so anti-religious, so suspicious of Christians or any other rival faith that that option really didn't seem possible, although we did hear of one or two people who called themselves Communist-Christians.

I: What was the impact of the anti-Christian movement at Yenching?

SAILER: I can't think of an anti-Christian movement at Yenching. There were some--there was a time when the student government was competed for by two rival groups: one was sort of the radical, tending toward a Communist national salvation group, in which most of our friends were. The other was known as the Christian Fellowship Group. At one time the Christian Fellowship Group was able to win majority support and did take over the student government. I may be very prejudiced on this, but I think they tended to be more the "anti" the radicals, than having any positive programs of their own. The head of that government was known as something of an operator. I think they tended to attract the sort of westernized students who did not have the dedication that the radical groups did.

Some of the radical students could be very unscrupulous in their politics and could bring very unpleasant pressure to bear at times of crisis, but, I guess, maybe I tended to be more tolerant of those kinds of things because at least it seemed to come out of real concern and not just power-seeking.

I: What contact with foreigners did you have outside of Yenching?

SAILER: I really had very few contacts with foreigners outside Yenching. I did teach a course once in the Catholic Fu Jen University in Peking. At the internment camp in Weihsien, we lived intimately with Catholic priests and felt a very deep friendship and fellowship with them that persisted some after the war. Some of our faculty went

to legation parties and knew the legation crowd or the business crowd quite well, but personally I did not. I had very little contact of that kind. I had the old YMCA people in the city, some of them Princeton men, who were our intimate friends and a few of the Peking Union Medical College people, but, in general, not with many until we were sent to the city from the campus in the summer of '42 and lived there till being sent to Weihsien in March of '43.

When I went to China, during the first three years, 1923-'26, we had a group there: The Sidney Gambles, Sidney of the Proctor-Gamble family, Carrington Goodrich, who has become a noted Chinese scholar, and others. We had a Sunday night group that used to meet around at different houses and different people would present topics for discussion.

I: Do you recall what some of your topics of discussion were?

SAILER: No, I am afraid I don't remember these topics of discussion. I am sure that Bernard Reed of PUMC talked on Chinese drugs. I am sure that Arthur Hummel, who was a deep lover of China, talked on Chinese culture and certain aspects, perhaps, of his own very deep interest in Chinese maps. I just don't really remember other topics. You know, it is a strange thing now to think that that was entirely a foreign group. I don't think we made any real effort to include Chinese in that group, although we were very close friends and all of us considered ourselves very liberal.

When in 1933 our little baby girl was born and died a year later and we had a little service in our house, we had only two or three Chinese members of the faculty there. That seems incredible to me now. As late as that, 1933, because our Chinese friends on the faculty became closer to us than most of the foreigners. Closest of all was Stephen Ts'ai (Ts'ai Yi-O)--Stephen and Lillie, of whom we were immensely fond. Stephen and I played a lot of tennis together and we cheerfully fought and denounced each other.

Stephen was quite anti-Communist and I was the other side. He thought I was sort of a wild radical and I told him what I thought of him, but we were very, very good friends and have continued as such. I admire him very much. He was a Yale man, and I used to accuse him of being more foreign than the foreigners. But I don't think that was fair. I think Stephen had many deep Chinese attitudes, too.

I: Why did Stephen Ts'ai and you get along so well even with your differing attitudes?

SAILER: Steve was a very refreshing straight-shooter, very congenial to Westerners, overlaying his fine Chinese qualities. We had our children in common and that was a very great thing. We played a great deal of tennis. I just plain liked Stephen. He was a great guy. We went on camping trips together and we could happily argue and fight together. I remember one time we got into a long very loud argument in the comptroller's office with the clerks looking as us in amazement that two supposedly fairly decent people would yell at each other like that. I am afraid we just enjoyed it and felt perfectly at home with each other. His boys and our boys were just about the same age and they were pretty fairly inseparable companions--both in Yenching and sometimes in the summer. Our children grew up with their children.

We became very close to some of our Chinese parent colleagues, although we were close to others as well, not on just that basis. Our two elder children went to Chinese schools for their first three years. The third one did not because he had been to America just at the wrong time, you may say, to come back and fit into Chinese school. So he went to a little foreign school right from the start as the others did from fourth grade up. I think they were the only foreign, western kids to go to the little Chinese school.

Some of the other Americans raised their eyebrows about it. I know that one family said that the Chinese children would spread disease among them and it would be dangerous to their health. Actually, the only spreading of disease that I remember was when one of our boys caught a cross-infection in the wonderful PUMC, brought it back--I guess it was measles--and spread it in his school. The spreading came from the foreigners to the Chinese. It came from this wonderful medical hospital, so we didn't take that kind of thing very seriously. It did help get our kids in with Chinese playmates whom they thoroughly enjoyed and this helped us get closer to their parents.

I: What concern was there that Yenching was educating an elite to be an elite?

SAILER: I think there was concern about elitism. Yenching fees tended to be higher than Tsinghua, which were very low or nothing by American standards. We tried to make self-help work possible for students, but that seemed to be more busy work and was against Chinese tradition and didn't go very deep. Individual faculty members would try to help out.

There were some scholarships given; but, in general, we tended to gather a wealthy student body. The fact that we had men and women on the same campus tended to favor that. As far as elitism is concerned, we certainly did get among the very best brains in China.

In general, Pei Ta and Tsinghua got still better selection than we did. Besides, if students passed our examinations and theirs, they were more apt to go to Tsinghua, especially, than to Yenching because of the very much lower cost and also it had great prestige; and they went to Pei Ta because it was culturally Chinese. On the other hand, we got some of the very best because their parents considered our general campus atmosphere as somewhat superior in the relationships between faculty and students and the fellowship on the faculty.

Our leading scholars were more likely to be Chinese than western, although we had a few very good Westerners. But Leighton Stuart was a genius at attracting the very best Chinese scholars--people of national reputation and real devotion. We had a very notable Chinese faculty.

I: You mentioned a little before about the interest in the Communists. Can you describe in more detail what you knew about the Communists in the late 1920s and early 1930s?

SAILER: Let me begin still further back when I went to the campus after language school in 1924. At one of the first evening parties I was invited to by western colleagues, the Thomas Breeces, there was a little student I happened to sit next to--a rather insignificant-looking student. He was pointed out as a real Communist. That man later went down to Canton and went out of China with Borodin. He was a real Communist but looked on, I gathered, with a sort of friendly apprehension. He did not do anything evil at the university as far as I know.

The first Christmas I was down there, rumors got around that the Communists were going to throw a bomb in Leighton Stuart's window. A few of us faculty members were sent out to sort of walk around and see if everything was quiet. The ridiculous rumor got around that Communists were going to mark chalk marks on the houses of the people they expected to kill. There was sort of a wonder of who these Nationalists and Communists were coming along. They seemed fierce people who may make real trouble for us. Of course, Chiang Kai-shek's advancing army from Canton contained both Communist and anti-Communist elements. Then he turned against the Communists and slaughtered a great many of them.

During that time, the Communists set up in Hunan Province. Hugh Hubbard, who was a perfectly wonderful missionary of the American Board, went down there to work in a district from which Communists had been driven. I remember him coming back and saying, "Yes, there has been an awful lot of very rough stuff." As Mao said, "A revolution is not like a dinner party." Hugh deplored that when he went down and tried to work with a reconstruction sort of social uplift group that was backed by Madame Chiang and he tried to put his heart into it. But when he saw what the Communists were actually doing, he made one remark I will always remember. He said, "After this kind of experience, a peasant will never just bow his head down again. He's stood up like a man and he's felt his power. China will never be the same again as far as these peasants are concerned."

I: What was your initial response to Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT?

SAILER: I really can't think just what I did think about Chiang Kai-shek as he came north. I think, on the whole, that we thought that the warlords were bad and we welcomed him. When there were a few killings in Nanking, including vice-president Williams of Nanking University, we were shocked and somewhat apprehensive as to what might happen. But on the whole, I think we tended to welcome him. It wasn't until later, really, that we came to admire what we knew of Communists, especially, of course, as the result of Edgar Snow and his reports.

I guess our students, and probably the Chinese faculty, tended to welcome Chiang and the Northern Expedition more than foreigners did, although I don't remember any sharp difference of opinion there.

I: How did your relationships develop among the students from 1930-1937? How were their needs, interests, moods, and so forth, changing during this time?

SAILER: I might speak of two other special, pretty great changes in developing the student attitudes. One was with regard to work. A student traditionally in China would not do what he would consider coolie work. I remember a little British lady, a colleague of ours, saying that when chairs needed to be moved in the classroom, she would pitch in and try to move them herself. Students were more likely to say, "Oh, call the janitor; call the coolie to do it," and feel that she was demeaning herself as a teacher by doing it. Well, a lot of us sort of felt it was our Christian duty to try to change that attitude. There were various attempts made to get students to serve as waiters in the dining hall, for self-help work,

or build a wall--doing physical labor in general--but coolie wages or ordinary wages were so little that all these jobs had to be heavily subsidized. It seemed somewhat of a farce.

At the same time, student attitudes were changing. I remember one trip that we went on where students grabbed their sleeping bag bundles and some of the girls' bags and carried them. That was something of a break-through--just the very fact that they would do it. Of course, we applauded that very much. I think that spirit grew greatly and sort of fed into the great Communist change.

The other relationship was that between men and women students. Traditionally there was very, very little contact. We would have them over to our house, purposely having men and women students together. I remember the men would talk to us and the women would talk to us, but they did not talk to each other. That changed very rapidly. By the end of the '30s they were interacting very, very freely. The Yenching campus made that very natural. They interacted naturally and freely in student demonstrations and patriotic work right from the start. They tended to get along very naturally together and without the American coquettishness and sexiness that we think of. This went very deep in Chinese tradition--this sort of naturalness.

I think, maybe, I like to claim credit for having led the first overnight group of both men and women students. A southern British missionary, named E. R. Hughes, and I went out to a hill a few miles away from Yenching, and we had an overnight party. Students talked practically all night--they didn't do much sleeping--but it was a great success. Then we had others. From then on, it seemed a rather natural thing for students to go out together, men and

women students, and have a lot of fun together without the problems of going off and "twosing" secretly. We who were supposed to be chaperones were not aware of it at least, and I really don't think it happened.

During the '30s, beginning with the Mukden Incident, the Japanese advanced and constantly took over more and more of the country. Student patriotism ran very high. From then on, we felt that the strikes were not against deans or against faculty members and not tied up with Yenching politics, but were really patriotic strikes. There was one big campaign to raise tin hats for the soldiers. I don't know of any of our students actually going out and becoming soldiers; although, in Chiang Kai-shek's army when they came north, I think there were a good many students.

Students did feel a very ardent desire to support a patriotic movement. They would often go out and try to talk to the country people. I remember when they came back, some of them said: "These country people are really not concerned about Japanese; they don't mean anything to them. What they are concerned about is taxes from the government." I think that tended to make students more aware of the necessity of changing their own government, not merely opposing Japanese. When they met Japanese troops, that changed.

I: What was the level of your relationships with students? How much did they confide in you?

SAILER: In this mental hygiene course that I gave to a very great many students, I would ask them to each write a paper, a description of some person, an actually living person. A great many of them took members of their family,

but a good many of them--I would say about one-third--took themselves. Then I would have usually up to an hour of an individual conference with them, asking questions and trying to interpret a little bit and sometimes, but, not often, running into a couple of hours or possibly more. That did bring an intimacy with students.

Han Suyin, in one of her books, mentioned me by name and in anything but an appreciative way. She took that course and said that she tried to get me involved in her personal problems, but that I was rather stand-offish. I think she was right in that. Han Suyin was an attractive student, very alive and intelligent. I was a little cautious about sort of getting very close to any--especially a woman--student, so I tried to treat her just the same way I did others. Also, I admired her a lot and I did not realize the problems she was up against in being Eurasian. She did write a quite striking paper about herself, but I really did not give her what she needed. I did not help her deal with the problem of being Eurasian.

She made another comment in that book that I think was an entire mismemory on her part, quoting me as saying, "The Chinese students were very reticent and would not confide, would not talk openly." I found that very untrue. I found the students, not all of them, but very many of them and to a surprising degree, were very free in talking over personal problems, questions of personality. They seemed very easy to get on a good relationship: But I think these conferences are something that did help in our student contacts. They weren't confined to people in my classes, but most of them were. Mainly, very often, we had students over to a meal or to come over at New Year's time to make dumplings at our house, and so on. Especially the psychology department students--who were very few--would meet fairly frequently at our house.

We felt a very great warmth and informality about student relationships. Certainly a number of the faculty felt the same way. We were very far from unique in that. The Louis E. Wolferz were very great entertainers of students--had them all the time. They took the more usual Christian approach to students and I think did a great deal for them.

I did sometimes try to help some students with personal problems, though I don't know as I did much. I don't think it was offering advice to them, counsel; I think more in terms that we would sort of discuss together these problems--more in that spirit. I don't think that I was wise enough to give advice and counsel, except maybe in one case to a student who had been proposed to by a foreign member of the faculty. She wondered whether this was really a sincere proposal on his part or whether he would marry her and then throw her over. From what I knew of this man, I did say that I didn't feel that he was that type. It turned out to be a very successful marriage.

I: Why were you particularly drawn to the "radical" students?

SAILER: I think I was drawn to radical students because they had very deep concerns that I had about poverty, about fundamental social change. We thought in similar terms, not just in terms of individual happiness. This was certainly true of the Lapwoods and it was certainly true of others, some of the Chinese faculty.

I: After your furlough in 1937-38, what concerns did you have for returning to China with the Japanese encroachment expanding?

SAILER: I don't think we hesitated in the least about going back in 1938. If Leighton Stuart felt that Yenching could exist, well, we were members of the faculty and it was up to us to go. Those were our friends and that was our work and we would go. Regarding the wisdom of Yenching remaining open, we would leave that to Leighton. It seemed to us that it was doing a good job, that it was making education possible for many students in North China who wouldn't have had that kind of education otherwise. The number of students was increased, although we did often feel very sympathetic with, and perhaps helped, some students who wanted to go out to West China, to what was Free China at that time.

I: What changes were evident when you returned to Yenching in 1938? What was the atmosphere and the morale?

SAILER: Naturally, the student movement had piped down during the Japanese occupation. It was a ticklish time, but Leighton was very, very skillful in maintaining the independence of Yenching. We took it for granted that our students were very anti-Japanese and tried to give them moral support in any way possible. These were the years, of course, of the approaching war. We never quite knew for sure that it was going to break and if so, when. In the spring of 1941, many of the families, including my own, returned to America. Let's see, were there any foreign families left there except the Shadicks who did not have children? I guess not, although, there were some in the missions--the Glysteen family and there were some families at the Weihsien Internment Camp.

With my family home, I had expected to escape to the hills before the Japanese. We thought we would have a little more warning, but it came very, very suddenly. I just happened to hear it over the radio. I happened to listen to the radio before 8:00 that morning of Pearl Harbor. My first thought was to rush over to the psychology department and get a big suitcase out of the way, of what I thought was Communist literature which a student had asked me to keep for a time. I got it back to him to dispose of before the Japanese actually came in. That could have been a very, very serious thing.

We were kept on campus, most of us in the south compound, until summer, then sent to the city to live in the American legation staff quarters of San Kuan Miao. Then, the following March, we were shipped to Weihsien Camp. The following September, perhaps 150-200 of the Americans were repatriated whose names were supplied from New York.

TAPE THREE-SIDE THREE

I: Why were some faculty repatriated in 1943 whereas others weren't?

SAILER: As far as we know, the faculty members who had sent their family members home in accordance with the government's advice were included in repatriation. Those who had stayed against government advice and also many single people were not sent at this time. There was one lady, a very dear colleague of ours, Peggy Barnes, who gave up her place. She was on the list, but she gave up her place voluntarily to someone else. Apparently that was possible; that seemed to be allowed.

I: What information on Yenching in Chengtu did you receive at Weihsien?

SAILER: I really don't remember what information we had on Chengtu. I don't believe we received any during the camp, but I think we had had it before. We'd known then that Yenching was started up again. Some of our faculty members felt that that was a bad move, that it should not have been done, but that all Yenching resources should have been conserved for after the war. But others approved.

I: Upon repatriation, what consideration did you give to immediately going to Chengtu and resuming your teaching responsibilities?

SAILER: On being repatriated, I felt that I was a member of the faculty and my duty was out there; they claimed to be very shorthanded out there. On the other hand, my wife had taken sole responsibility for our three sons ever since she had left in the spring of '41. It certainly seemed right for me to stay over another year. That was the year that we taught at Berea College.

I: How were you able to return to Chengtu in 1945? How many other western faculty returned at this time?

SAILER: It was certainly very difficult to get permission to return to Chengtu. One had to make repeated attempts. Finally, I was able to ship on a freighter out there along with a fellow member of the faculty, a Chinese chemist, and we went over the Hump. We went to India by this freighter and then over the Hump and through Kunming. We spent a night there and then to Chungking and then on to Chengtu. I was the only western faculty member that returned at that time and I guess I was the only Yenching Westerner there in Chengtu by the time I got there. Grace Boynton and Ralph Lapwood had been there earlier, but were not there when I was.

I: What was the state of Yenching that you returned to in Chengtu?

SAILER: My experience in Chengtu--I did some teaching and showed how very poor an administrator I was. I misunderstood the situation; people had complained so much, had talked so much of being overworked and just were barely able to get along, so I tried to see what ways could be taken to relieve them. There was a non-Yenchinger, Mr. T.L. Shen, who tended to be quite radical in his political views and who had been a great friend of Ralph Lapwood's. I worked with him more, perhaps, than with the somewhat more conservative Yenching faculty.

Mr. Ma Kiam was the head. He and I were supposed to be administrating together, with him being the head of the institution and I carrying on correspondence with the trustees in New York. Mr. Ma was very conservative from my point of view, but got along well with the Kuomintang Government as he really had to do. I think he found me very much a pain in the neck in my sympathy with the more radical students there.

I: How did you misunderstand the situation there?

SAILER: In Chengtu I should have understood that people don't really suffer from overwork and privation nearly as much as they do from lack of appreciation and respect. I should have gone around and talked with each member of the faculty sympathetically and tried to see whether there was anything we could do to make their work not lighter, but more satisfying. I was too much influenced by T.L. Shen, who was a very dynamic guy and for whom Ralph Lapwood had great respect and whose political views I couldn't agree with more. T.L. was sort of a loner in the faculty and I think that I should have realized that much better.

That winter I got virus pneumonia and was in the hospital for a fair amount of time, but I was able to resume my classroom teaching. The quarters in Chengtu were so infinitely simpler than those we had had in Peking. The student body was very much smaller, but I think the spirit was good and a certain service was done for those students. (That can always be a matter of opinion.) It kept a group of faculty together, but they felt quite bad, some of them, on return to the Yenching campus, that they were looked on maybe a little bit as outsiders, that they had not stayed in Peking the way that others had. I think those things were patched up and I don't think anything very serious came out of that.

When I came back to Yenching, Dr. C.W. Luh was very firmly in charge. He formed his executive committee--they had already had one year and I have forgotten who was on the executive committee then. He was going to put me and Jimmy Pike, a more junior member of the faculty, on the executive committee, but I very definitely declined because I felt at that time that Dr. Y.P. Mei should be on rather than me. As far as representing western faculty concerns, the person should certainly be Ralph Lapwood. C.W. Luh didn't know Ralph especially well, but he decided to do that. Both Ralph and Y.P. were put on the executive committee. I did not have administrative responsibilities, which suited me beautifully.

After a year--I think it was just one year--Dr. Luh took a year off. There had been a good deal of tension on campus and tension perhaps between trustees and Dr. Luh, too, who was more aggressive in supporting Chinese interests. Dr. Luh just withdrew completely for a year. Bill Adolph, with whom I had roomed at Weihsien, was made president of the University.

I: What was the faculty-student response when a Westerner became president again?

SAILER: I think Bill Adolph was probably preferred by some of the Chinese faculty and by most members of the English department. C.W. Luh had represented a much more deeply Chinese section of the faculty. But I think that most of this group were sort of willing to have Bill Adolph, who was very much respected as a scholar and a very nice guy, to take over all this administrative hassle in New York and leave C.W. free. C.W. acted really very decently during that time. He and Bill were good friends and respected each other. I certainly don't think there was, or I wasn't aware of, any deep opposition to this move either from students or faculty.

Returning to the difficulties, the education department was shot at that time. I have forgotten who had carried on, but the first year I was back Bill Adolph asked me to take over the chairmanship of the department while the one remaining Chinese instructor, Mr. Liao T'ai Ch'u, went to America for study. I arranged to invite my very good friend, Hu Mon Yu, who had been a student at Yenching--a brilliant student in biology--to come over and join me in the education department. We were really two outsiders running the department together. She was extremely bright and very congenial to work with. While our standard of teaching may not have been high, it was a lot of fun and we really had a good body of students.

We felt very close to them. They were enthusiastic and they did a lot of practical work in the little campus school and another little school out in the nearby village. At least we were not bound by traditions of the past, and we did things that might have been called innovative.

Just before the Communists came in, I think, we arranged to set up an exhibit of teaching materials on the elementary level. Our students worked terribly hard. I was responsible more for arithmetic and Mun Yu for Chinese teaching and for science teaching since science was her specialty. We put on quite a show. When the Communist representatives came in and saw it, they were somewhat impressed because it was along their interest in making education as practical as possible. They wanted it set up in the city for all the elementary school teachers of the city. As a foreigner it seemed better for me (we were somewhat in the dog house then) not to go in and even see the set up, but I cheered from the background. Our students went in and simply worked themselves dead tired in putting on some kind of show which seemed to be well-received.

Some of those students were simply beautiful people in their relationship with the kids that they worked with--and with all the relationships. They tended to be a dedicated group. When the Communists came in, they welcomed them very strongly. I think we were fairly much of an outstanding department in our welcome to the new regime.

I am getting a little ahead of my story--coming back to the years before the new government took over, before Chieh Fang. That was the time when students were going out to join the incoming Communists and there seemed to be real danger from the police. When any would come for refuge to our house (I have even forgotten which student it was who lived in our house), they stayed largely in bed for some weeks in order to hide from the police.

One night there was a group of about six-eight who were going over the wall that same night and were going to go out and join the guerrillas. They did; they went out and joined the incoming Communist army. I remember seeing them over the wall. Just before they were going to go, one of them--who was sort of senior--said he had suddenly decided not to go. So we had him in our house. He was a very good friend. I took him down and hid him in the bushes by a little pond on campus and left him some food. The next morning when I came to look, I saw that he had been most inadequately hidden and could have been spotted very easily, but I think we exaggerated the danger. We hid him better. For a day or two we gave him food and then he went to the home of a Chinese family. Well, there were various incidents like this--this was just one.

I: How many other faculty members were involved in aiding students like this?

SAILER: Certainly Leighton Stuart did all he could to aid students when they got into political trouble. He was very sympathetic with them. I am not aware that any other faculty members did this particular kind of thing, any other foreign faculty members, but some Chinese faculty were involved. In fact, this man who hid in the bushes then went to a Chinese faculty home. There may have been a great deal more of that going on than I realized. I think that we were rather well-known among western faculty members as being sympathetic with the student movement. I think they trusted us and very naturally turned to us in this. (I think Ralph was on the campus at that time. I don't know that this was just his way of working, but he was certainly deeply trusted by students also.)

I: What was the general state of mind at Yenching as the Communists approached?

SAILER: As the Communist armies advanced, it is sort of hard to say what our state of mind was. Certainly there must have been many people who were apprehensive and hoped that the Kuomintang would be able to hold them. On the other hand, others of us felt that the Kuomintang had lost its mandate of heaven and had hopes of Communists, although we didn't really know what would happen when they came in. As the armies swept ahead with amazing rapidity we sort of braced ourselves.

Our second son Henry had come out to Yenching at that time and he and another American student went out to the hills to meet the Communists. Instead of them asking him for anything, as other soldiers might have done, he bummed a cigarette off them. The situation was reversed. Before they came we had been afraid of the looting of the retreating soldiers. Actually, we sort of hid some of our bedding and some food in case of emergency, but there was no trouble over that. The new army swept in and behaved impressively well.

Our cook was especially impressed with the courtesy of the new soldiers in paying for everything, helping sweep the yard, and so on, even though they were billeted in his house. That, of course, is never very convenient for anybody.

I: What did your son and the other American have in mind when they went off to meet the Communists?

SAILER: Oh, I guess just curiosity, adventure. No great fear. We were not apprehensive. Our general feeling was one of great hope and welcome.

It just happened that I had broken my wrist in a bicycle accident, quite a bad break, and I was laid up with a good deal of pain just at the particular time of the Communists coming in. But I remember fairly early attending an entertainment that they gave with the utmost vigor and pep, in our big auditorium. There was a lift in the air and a feeling that now something good has happened.

I remember going down to the last bus that had left Yenching just before the Communists came in. It was known that they would be in the next day. We said goodby to some of our colleagues who went into Peking and flew out from there. Then those that were left were either those who could not find it practical to get away or those who wanted to stay--some with apprehension; some with very active welcome to the new government.

To go back to 1946, coming back from Chengtu. I got jaundice from, I think (or connected with), a very fine feast of a Yenching graduate. It had been a very hot day and I enjoyed it: I had too much fat meat and I developed jaundice, but I decided to go on the bus in any case. These buses were fairly precarious. You would get them piled high with luggage and maybe 20 of us on top of that. I suggested that since buses overturned sometimes wouldn't it be well to have a little drill maybe--a little practice--that if the bus seemed to be turning over, we would decide just how we would try to land on our feet. I remember a friend of mine on the bus, a young Chinese, said, "Oh, don't mention anything like that as that would be bad luck to suggest any such plan as that." Feeling very rotten, I went on that bus trip. Then, finally in Sian, I got a bad fever and had to lie up in the mission hospital run by some British group, British Baptist I think, and then later flew on to Shanghai. There I was able to get transportation up to Peking after some days of difficulty.

I arrived back in Yenching the very day that there was a goodbye party for Ambassador Stuart, who had just been appointed ambassador and was leaving the campus at that time. I think most of the faculty were very greatly complimented, were very happy that he had attained this high position, and hoped that the American government knew how thoroughly dedicated to China he was and hoped he would be able to do something for the welfare of China in keeping American relations with China as good as possible.

On the other hand, C.W. Luh said to me two or three times: "I feel Leighton is making a bad mistake. He should not accept this ambassadorship." As time went on, I felt that C.W. was quite right. If Leighton had not been tied up with American foreign policy, I think he would have been able to be a wonderful mediator--he was trusted in America and he was very much trusted in China. When he became American ambassador, he went over to sort of the official position, although he was still a very irregular type of ambassador. He kept Philip Fu as his most intimate advisor and had Philip, who was sort of his agent, make appointments and keep contact with both sides. Hung Hua, who is now foreign minister and who was the Communist representative in Nanking, and Leighton could talk freely, although sort of officially, with each other.

Well, it is hard to say. Leighton was finally not able--he wanted to accept Mao Tse-tung's invitation to go up to Peking and really confer, but the American State Department absolutely vetoed that. It was under the influence of Senator Knowland and other people of the China lobby--at that time the American policy was pretty much ham-strung. Leighton himself always kept a sort of a wishful hope that Chiang Kai-shek would reform. He said, "<u>If he only will</u>." Then he could never give up the hope of that; of course, he was a rather close friend of the generalissimo. Stuart did not approve of what he was doing, but he always held on to this hope.

Temperamentally, I think, Leighton was an aristocrat of Virginia, and I don't think he had any natural proclivity for revolutionary change. That wasn't his type and I think he thought in the terms of the intelligentsia rather than the peasants. I don't think he felt the kind of revolutionary fervor that some others of the faculty had felt, especially Mr. Wu Lei-ch'uan, who was chancellor of Yenching. I didn't understand Wu Lei-ch'uan's position. I looked at him as a very respected old man until I read Philip West's book on Yenching: Yenching University and Sino-Western Relations, 1916-1952. That book really brought out to me a great deal of the significance of Yenching that I had missed before.

While he was ambassador, Leighton came back occasionally to campus. On one of those occasions, I had a two-hour talk with him in which he was laying out his plan for American troops trying to hold the railroad--Peking to Shanghai to Hankow to Peking. That seemed to me to show that somehow he had lost touch with the realities of China in spite of his very vast knowledge which was so much greater than mine. It made me think of the giant Anteus, who, when he was lifted up from the earth, became weak. When he got in contact with the earth again, he renewed his strength many times. Somehow, when Leighton was in direct touch with Chinese of our faculty and our student body, then he was wonderfully able to get their point of view which represented so much of real sentiment in China. When he got in the legation atmosphere, then he was pulled off of the solid earth of China. That, to me, was a very great tragedy, although Leighton will always remain to me a revered figure.

He was a big man in the sense of being able "to talk with kings nor lose the common touch" with students and with us on the faculty.

I: You spoke of the administrative committee that was set up after the war. What long-range planning did this committee do? How did they view the future?

SAILER: I don't know. I would guess that at the time the university was simply hoping for the best, was doing the best work it could to hold people together and keep this international aspect alive, to keep what were to many of us the fundamental Christian values.

I: Would you explain more fully what you would consider were the fundamental Christian values of Yenching?

SAILER: This question really puts me on the spot. I think we would simply say respect for each other, common service, not making particular beliefs a matter of division, a respect for people regardless of their social standing or their money or their nation. I think just wide, warm fellowship. Now that is vague.

By the way, on Christian values, this reminds me of something. I remember during the '30s, I think it was, Leighton Stuart rather wryly reported a very complimentary article about Yenching in the Ta Kung Pao which was a leading Chinese newspaper. The article said something like this: "Congratulations that Yenching is no longer a Christian institution." Well, to us Yenching was a very powerful Christian institution of the kind we would want to work in. But what the Ta Kung Pao meant by that was that the typical Christian institution would never think of having a leading non-Christian on the faculty and would be very constantly evangelistic and

would not become really Chinese. They put Christian on the one hand and Chinese on the other. The article said: now Yenching has become a Chinese institution, rather than a Christian institution.

That makes me think of the reparations question. That has really seemed to me to be such a stark betrayal of the ideas of Yenching. We should always try to be Chinese and then to say that this was owned in New York by the trustees and, therefore, reparations had to be demanded from the Chinese people even though so many of our old faculty were carrying on right on the old campus. Also those faculties--their assets in America were frozen. They were not able to get their annuity.

A word more about that, although I am sure the story is well-known. The Americans were getting the impression that the Chinese government just seized Yenching away from the American support as though they'd come out and hijacked it. What actually happened was that Yenching was dependent on its American support from the trustees. Finally, that support was cut off by our government. They said only by special application were trustees allowed to send to institutions in China. The trustees applied for permission and were turned down. Yenching obviously had no other means of support. Then the Chinese government came in and gave it support. I think it had given some grants before. So it was our government that really would have killed off Yenching if it had not been rescued by the Chinese government.

Of course, I don't imply that Yenching would have continued as a separate institution or under any kind of private control. Very likely foreign support would not have been welcomed at all after '51. But it was the American, not the Chinese government, that forced the break first of all.

Many of its traditions, fine traditions, continued right there on the same campus when it became part of Peking University.

The night before we left--this was in August of 1950--the Communists had been in control, then, for about 20 months. We spent the night in the president's house (I've forgotten just why, but we did). I remember going out on the lake next to the president's house and hearing the Christian students singing "Abide With Me." That is one of my very last memories of Yenching campus at that time until we went back 23 years later in 1973.

I: How was Yenching able to cope with inflation after the war?

SAILER: I really don't know how Yenching was able to cope with tremendous inflation. We Westerners were getting our money in U.S. dollars. There were some Chinese contributions to the university. The great bulk of the money came in Chinese currency. It was very, very difficult for Chinese faculty. When their salaries would come in, they would often rush off and try to purcahse food as fast as they could before the price went still higher. Money simply, pretty literally, melted away as you held it. Even though the very highest Chinese bank note was for $10,000 then--and we had plenty of them around--it was worth four cents in American money. You would have to have endless counting of these $10,000 bills in order to get any kind of respectable sum. I handled millions of dollars myself for personal accounts, but I think only once did I have a check for a billion dollars in my hand--and it belonged to the university. I asked them to let me hold it because it was my one and only chance to hold a check for a billion dollars.

I: What were the varying responses of the faculty and students to the political situation from 1946 to the turnover?

SAILER: One incident I think about was in 1947. Dr. Luh was speaking in the women's college chapel to a small group, leading chapel that morning. He simply broke down when he said, "I see no hope for China in my lifetime or the lifetime of my children." This was after the blood suckers had come down from the West, Chungking--the Kuomintang representatives--and they simply betrayed the wonderful hopes the Chinese had had of the settlement of the war. That was when so many intellectuals finally turned and said, "We don't like Communists; we don't know them. We fear them to some extent, but they're the only possible hope of China. We'll make the best of them if they take over."

I: What was the role and impact of the Communist students at Yenching?

SAILER: No one knew how many actual Communist party members there were at Yenching. Finally, sometime after liberation, their names were published. There were students and only one or two sort of assistants on the faculty--none of the major faculty members. I think maybe 13 in all on the list. The most notable, perhaps, was Mr. Yang Ju Chi, Dr. Leighton Stuart's secretary. He was a very good friend of ours. He helped host us when we returned in 1973. He had been an actual party member for some time and a very dedicated one.

I: How did the actual turnover occur and how did students and faculty respond at that time?

SAILER: The turnover seemed to be welcomed probably by a much larger proportion of the student body than actually did welcome it because how the other people, the rightists, were out of favor. They had to watch their step. Those that really welcomed the new government were really jubilant and seemed to be the dominant student group. Certainly they represented a great deal of the finest in our student body.

I remember two or three faculty members saying, "Students have learned only to protest, to be negative; now, when the Communists have come in, they will see that they can no longer protest. The Communists will not stand for that. Then what is going to happen to them?" Well, what actually happened was that those who had been most active in protesting turned and became most enthusiastic, on the whole, in joining and working for the Communist regime--very many becoming Kan Pu. I remember Hsieh Ching Fang of our department and how she went in to help rehabilitate prostitutes in Peking. She came back with her eyes partly teary with sympathy for them and partly shining with the idea that now they were going to have a new life. We saw some of our best students go off on the train to become Communist workers in different parts of the country with a great deal of real enthusiasm, giving up the rest of their education.

The Communist army came into Yenching a couple of months before it took over Peking. It could, of course, have bombarded Peking and taken it over almost immediately, but it did not want to destroy the city. It waited and negotiated. Finally Fu Tso-yi turned it over to them and then became an official in the new government. So there was a time when we were pretty much cut off from the city and could not travel back and forth. I remember Doak Barnett and Archie Steel, two very competent reporters, came out to Yenching, got through the lines and visited us in our house and probably had a meal with us before they went back to the city.

I: What were the responses of the Yenta Fellowship to the turnover?

SAILER: I don't remember any special reaction of the Christian fellowship as such. I think it went right on, except that fellowship groups, I guess, maybe, did not meet from that time on because there were all these hsueh-hsi groups--these discussion groups the Communists had started organizing. One of them met at our house at least one or two times and I heard something what it was like. While we were there, before 1950, we were never urged, and certainly not required, to join in such a group. So it was the people who stayed longer who had that experience that we missed.

I: Why were the Lapwoods the foreigners who were welcomed the longest at Yenching after the turnover?

SAILER: Lapwood was a very competent mathematics instructor. I think he certainly deserved to stay on the longest. Then in '53 he was told: "You can do more valuable work by going back to England and telling about us." Another Britisher, Lucy Burtt, was a perfectly splendid person and she stayed on rather long, too, but her center was much more in the School of Religion. I don't think she found it quite so easy to stay on as the Lapwoods did. The Lapwoods had thrown themselves into the revolution. They wrote a little book, Through the Chinese Revolution; they had always been very pro and have revisited since.

I: After the turnover, what changes were made at Yenching until the time you left in 1950?

SAILER: Naturally, the radical students were enthusiastic and very active. I remember one of my fine education students coming to me during that time and saying, "How can we

cooperate with you in making our class better and helping the poorer students to get ahead and helping them to study harder?" There was that belief in cooperation. Teachers were not supposed to be autocrats, but there was that fine spirit of cooperation. I remember one of my students, a perky little Canton girl, who at one time said that I was not teaching according to proper Marxist principles. When I challenged her and asked her exactly what she meant and said that I thought that I was not violating them, she really didn't have anything to say. We remained very good friends.

There was this earnestness, continued earnestness about study and the feeling that now they were really training themselves for something useful. Before, there had been so much frustration about when they got out into the world, would they have a real place where they could do anything, where the government set up would allow them to do anything.

I: Can you provide more details on the political re-education that was carried out after liberation?

SAILER: I know students would maybe go over to Tsinghua and listen to a three-hour lecture and then a tremendous amount of discussion. I guess this was in lieu of classroom work, or maybe that was in a break of the session because I think our classroom work on the whole continued pretty normally. There was a lot of political education and an infinite amount of discussion. That is typical of the Communist re-education program. When I was there, I was not conscious of the business of confession and accusation. It became so prominent later.

When we actually came to leave, Mrs. Chao (Hu Non-yu) and a few students came to see us off at the train station. I think that was a little daring on their part because foreigners were somewhat in the dog house. Shortly before I left, I asked for and got a chance to see Kung P'eng, who later became minister of the government, a really wonderful woman whom we had known very well. She married Ch'iao Kuan Hua, who became foreign minister. Then she died and later he married someone else who was mixed up with the Gang of Four. He fell into disfavor, but we had met him through her.

I: You saw them in Shanghai during your 1973 visit?

SAILER: I saw them both, as I remember, in Shanghai, in 1946, en route to Peking. I had a little picture of them in our home in Yenching. She came around and we had a last talk before we left China. She was a real dedicated Communist, but we remained very warm friends. I always respected her immensely. Her older sister was the one whom we saw in Lahore and who was then our big hostess in Peking in 1973.

I: Why did you specifically ask to see Kung P'eng? Do you recall what you were able to discuss with her?

SAILER: I had always had a very great admiration for Kung P'eng. I think we met on the porch of one of the PUMC houses in the north compound in the city. I don't know just why there. Anyway, I respected her extremely. I liked her; we had been very close. I think probably what I asked her was how she felt I could best interpret the new China to fellow Americans. I think our conversation probably centered on that. I felt she was pretty tough. She was very dedicated. She certainly was a follower herself of the party line. I am sure that I listened in this talk much more than I talked.

I: How do you respond to the statement that Yenching students felt they had to compensate for associations with the missionary enterprise?

SAILER: I think during the '30s there was something of this. Yenching students would be told: "Oh, you're going to a Christian institution and a sort of a luxurious one." I think some of them did feel that pressure. At one time, about 1935, the Yenching students sort of had the leadership of the student movement of the city. They were not quite so vulnerable to the police or to spies. I think they got along very well with students of other institutions. Chinese students were marvelous in their activity and in their sense of responsibility to organize and to really have an influence on history. Just how important this sort of pressure was of being members of a Christian student body--certainly it didn't prevent them from feeling a very active part in the movement, but it made them more active and it certainly helped them with having leadership at times of danger in that movement.

On two occasions after liberation, I went in with our students to Tien An Men, Peking Red Square. One of them was October 1st when the government was really inaugurated. We all stayed there all day and then marched at the end of the day past Mao Tse-tung, way up on the Tien An Men Gate. It was a great thrill on that occasion. I think I was the only faculty member to go to that particular demonstration, to go to demonstrations at that time. Possibly my memory fails me on that, but I am pretty sure I was the only western faculty member. I felt a big thrill in this and was very happy to be part of it. I felt I was privileged to be part of it.

I do know there was some uneasiness about foreigners. I don't remember as to those demonstrations, but when I went over to Tsinghua Station to see some of my favorite students off when they were leaving for the South to become Kan pu (I thought I would never see them again), I did sort of stay in the background. I didn't make myself too obvious. They came over and said goodby and then they entrained.

I think they were conscious of the fact that perhaps we would never be able to get back to Yenching after the war. The Korean War had already started, but Americans and China, yet, had not come into direct conflict. Actually, the ship on which we intended to come back was taken off as a troop ship for Americans. We didn't know much about the war, but we very much deplored the fact that America and China had come into conflict. We maintained our hope of being able to get back up to the spring of '51. Then we saw that it would be impossible, so we looked around and took that into account in our plans. From then on, we simply wrote-off our experience in China with wonderful memories, but with the feeling that our part there was finished. We left our "things" with our friends for their use or any other disposition should we not return.

I: What consideration did you give to not going on furlough and remaining in China?

SAILER: If we had been sure that we would never get back to China I suppose we would have been more deeply tempted to stay. On the other hand, both Louise and I felt that we had not given our boys the support that we should have, that we ought to be closer to them. We didn't take too seriously any contribution we could make to Yenching. We were eager to try to interpret the new China in America. I don't think we really had any thought of postponing our return.

I: What was the misunderstanding that occurred that led to your being denounced at Yenching?

SAILER: After we came back, I was asked on two occasions to report on Yenching when the question was up as to whether support would be continued by the trustees in New York or whether Yenching was now a sort of hopeless institution from the Christian standpoint. One of these occasions was down in Princeton Dodge Hall of the Philadelphia Society there. I think maybe John Rockefeller III was there. If he wasn't, he was at the meeting of the Princeton Club in New York. I made a statement there in which I said that Yenching had a wonderful chance and still kept up that chance of being a place where Americans and other foreigners and Chinese could live and work together with real fellowship even in these difficult times.

I said something about the Voice of America, which I felt was ineffective in China, tending to be irritating because it was not a common enterprise. Time magazine made a report of this--a rather brief report--in which they said that I had said that Yenching was even more effective than the Voice of America in promoting friendship between the two countries. That was picked up and I think very rightly resented in China because it looked as though I was saying that Yenching is trying to do the same thing that the Voice of America is doing--that is, to implement American foreign policy, which is certainly not the way I had ever looked at Yenching and which was very, very contrary to the spirit of Yenching. I considered writing Time a letter. But I could see, if they ever printed it at all, what they would say. They would put a note on it and say that their reporter was right there. He verified what I said; that they had reported it correctly. Then it would look worse than ever. I made up my mind that an American was not able to think in Yenching terms with a reporter like that.

In that meeting, continued support of Yenching was voted with only one dissenting vote. Then, in the New York meeting at the Princeton Club, I was at least courteously received. The trustees apparently did vote to continue support of Yenching, although they may not have agreed with me nearly as much as they courteously might have led me to believe. My good friend, Eddie Watts, was at the Princeton Club meeting. He and I differed absolutely with regard to reparations and really, to me, what Yenching was all about, but we have remained good friends.

I wrote back to campus, wrote to Ralph Lapwood, of what I felt about that Time report. He, apparently, told it to certain friends, but I don't, in the least, resent the attack that was made on me. I haven't heard the details of it, but I think there was a very strong desire on the part of the Chinese government to free students, especially Yenching students, from too much friendliness toward America. The desire was to orient them in a different direction, away from sort of the luxurious life at Yenching that it represented, away from the pro-American life. If they were unfair in some of that, which I think they were, in attacking some of the American faculty that were left, I think the reason was because they are, after all, propagandists and they were doing it for a purpose.

When I went back, long later, I didn't know whether the onus of that attack would have remained. I did have it hinted to me that some of our best friends had been, at least, questioned and perhaps somewhat attacked on the grounds of having been our special friends; although I don't know if that was connected with the denunciation or simply that they did have American friends.

When Ambassador Huang Hua came to Canada, I wrote to him with a good deal of trepidation. I didn't know if he would consider me a bourgeois, but he wrote back very courteously after a time. He didn't catch up with his mail for some months. Then, when he came to New York, I finally, after another friend of mine had done the same thing, asked if I could drop in and see him. He responded very cordially and took me out to lunch with Mrs. Huang, a very charming lady, and we talked for three hours. After that time, he was very courteous in inviting us to the U.N. functions at the office of the United Nations.

On one occasion there, he said to me very courteously, "I am very busy now; I haven't got time to talk, but won't you stay afterward and talk?" I felt that would be a great imposition on him with all the people he had to see, so Henry and my wife and I slipped away at the proper time. We heard afterward that he had sent for us and was looking everywhere for us. We would have had time for a very fine talk with him.

It was Huang Hua, along with Kung P'u-sheng, who were instrumental in getting us permission to go back to China. The story of that was that our son, Henry, was so eager to go back and he asked if I would use my old friendships just to see if I could get him back to China. I wrote to Ambassador Huang, who had said something courteous about our going back, and said our greatest dreams would be fulfilled if our son could go back. Then he welcomed that and our son went up to see him. He remarked to us that the old folks should go, too. Then we gave in; we capitulated. We arranged to go, too, and had our wonderful trip.

I: What reunions with Yenching people did you have in '73?

SAILER: When we came back to go in '73, we had heard of other visitors who had seen maybe two or three of their old friends. We were asked to give a list and we didn't want to make it too long. We picked out 18 people of our old colleagues at Yenching. We actually saw 16 of them and quite a few others besides. We saw about 56 old friends in China in general. Of the 18, one had died, Mrs. Luh Chi-hwei, and one, Paul Wang, the former registrar, they said was in poor health and was not politically active at all. I think that this was probably physical rather than political health.

Our hosts were just so eager to see that we saw the people we wanted to see, not only in Peking, but in Shanghai and Canton as well. That was a marvelous experience to see these old friends. For most of them, they seemed very full of beans and seemed happy. There were two or three that we were concerned about, that we felt had been having a hard time, but they didn't tell us about it. Since then we have learned that, yes, these were tough times and that the present time is so much better than then.

When we arrived on the campus at Yenching, to the old campus--now Peking University--outside the president's house down at the circle, we got out of our cars, sort of blinking. A rather small man stepped up, extended his hand and said, "I'm Rand Sailer. Who are you?" It took me just a moment to see that that was Robert Chao; then the J.C. Lis were there and our old cook was there. What a wonderful time. They gave a dinner for us. We spent these three days, two and one-half days, right on campus with our old cook cooking for us in the hostel. It was arranged that I could talk with three remnants of psychology teachers there. There was very little psychology going on.

We visited only one class in Peking University, most of our time being spent with old friends. We have recently been told that when we were to show up there, the word was passed around that it was all right to see the Sailers. It won't be held against you if you come around. So many of our old friends then did.

I: From 1950 until 1973, what contact, if any, did you have with Yenching staff in China?

SAILER: We wrote a few letters in the very early days, but I think a lot would only be maybe one or two Chinese friends because we just didn't know whether we would embarrass them. Then we were cut off entirely and did not write a single letter to China, except the one to the Kungs, until after the Nixon visit when it became possible to do so again with what we felt was relative safety. This really tore our hearts, but, anyway, we wanted to play on the safe side.

Now I think I mentioned Kung P'u-sheng showing up in Lahore when we were there. We went to a meeting and caught her eye. Then I went out and had not more than five minutes with her as she was rushing off to a reception. She was extremely cordial and gave us some pictures from China that we valued very much--very nice ones. It was simply rapid-fire asking about old friends. This was, I think, in the winter of '55-'56.

When we got back from Lahore, we went back on a short trip to see my parents in April '56 to August or September. While we were home, a cable was forwarded to us from the Peking government inviting us to go back for one month. I am quite sure that that came at the instigation of the Kung sisters, though we had no letter from them.

We didn't receive the letter. I didn't hear anything then from them. We were really cut-off for all those years, just hoping that American public opinion would change, but not really making any contribution to that change, except in our casual conversations. I don't believe I was asked to make a single speech on China during that time.

I: How were your relationships with the western faculty affected, if they thought of you as something of a "screw-ball radical" as you once referred to yourself?

SAILER: We Yenching faculty had very warm, personal bonds in general. Naturally, some more than others. We didn't approve of each others' points of view, and other people could think of me as a screw-ball without my minding especially. Maybe they wouldn't describe it that way, just realizing that this was a difference in opinion. Some of my very best friends and I differed very strongly politically, and we used to argue.

TAPE FIVE

In faculty meetings we had pretty hot exchanges, but it was all in friendship. The arguments, I guess, were mostly on faculty policy regarding students. I don't think there were any real hard feelings there. We simply differed.

Regarding this cable that came in the middle of April--we couldn't do anything about it then. But then it was renewed by a cable to New York before we left New York again. Well, we were torn. We could have simply slipped off to Europe and gotten in as Ida Pruitt and a few other people had done. On the other hand, we had our work, our obligations in Lahore; the American Embassy wouldn't hear of our getting a visa to China. I felt that I am not a natural reporter. If I came back from a brief trip to China, I

am not a good propagandist, that I would be looked on as a sort of a thorough Communist by being allowed to go back and I would not really cut any ice with American public opinion. I don't know if that was a wise decision or not. Anyway, we gave up the idea of going. One thing, it would have been a great expense, and another, it would have meant losing our passport permanently and having to cut short our work in Pakistan, which we felt obligated to do.

Two or three years after that, I did write a letter to the Kung sisters and raised the question as to whether that invitation might again be renewed, but time passed. I don't know if they ever got the letter.

I: How would you assess Yenching's development of indigeneity?

SAILER: I don't think I can really assess Yenching's progress. I think that Leighton Stuart was the <u>great</u> leader in this, but I think that Philip West's book brings out that, after all, Yenching was a western institution, supported by western money. In a sense, we faculty followed American thoughts and values and were just not deeply in touch with the deeper undercurrents in Chinese life. I did not realize at all, until I read Philip's book, the significance of Chancellor Wu Lei-ch'uan, who was really a great man. He would have transferred Yenching into a revolutionary institution, a Christian revolutionary institution, but how would the finances have been kept up under those circumstances? We felt proud of ourselves and really the great betrayal to me was when reparations were asked for as though we were an institution owned by the trustees.

Of course, their point of view was that they were representing the Chinese church; however, I won't go into that and try to argue that out now. I think the warm fellowship

on campus was an attempt among Westerners and higher Chinese faculty to live on the same standards of living. This was very helpful, although we foreigners tended still to have privileges in various ways. We certainly didn't solve that problem entirely.

Our curriculum was very largely in English--I never developed real competence in teaching in Chinese, although I had used Chinese and English in a sort of muddled way--and the last years of my teaching were when the English standard went down among students, especially after liberation.

I: How much English was used at Yenching after Liberation?

SAILER: Less than before. Our students tended then to talk more in Chinese. (Later, then, was great emphasis on giving up western textbooks, but that had not come at this time.) I used to hash in Chinese off and on. I think Chinese students used much more Chinese in classroom discussion than they had before. But bearing with my infirmities, they still used a great deal of English and some of them had very excellent English.

I: How did students handle both Christianity and patriotism?

SAILER: The greatest pressures against being considered Christian came definitely after we left in 1950. I don't feel I have anything to add to assessment of those. Students were struggling with this question during our time. Maybe a good light came on it in 1973 when we went back. We visited the Institute of Minorities. I raised the question with a few old friends there. I said that I knew, of course, that the policy of China was definitely the feeling that religion was a harmful thing. I said, "Now how is it viewed? Is it viewed more as a worn-out superstition that will fall away of itself, or is it viewed more as definitely subversive and harmful?"

The answer that I got seemed to show that it was considered maybe both. I remember one very fine younger faculty member, he had been in sociology in Yenching and was in the Institute of Minorities where our sociologists tended to gather. He had been a most earnest Christian. He had risked his life very definitely and spent months in a prison out in Turkestan, out of his deep Christian conviction that he wanted to pioneer out there. I don't know the story in detail and can't tell it, but there is no question of the depth of his religious conviction.

He said at this time that he felt that the Christian faith simply talked of love, but did not implement love in a sufficiently vital way. We expressed Christianity individually and he thought that was good as far as it went, but that we did not believe in revolutionary social change. Therefore, he implied that he had found the Communist faith deeper and more satisfying than the Christian faith. I am not sure whether his wife agreed with that or not. She didn't express herself, but he seemed to be speaking for the group there. I think that was true of many, many of our old friends.

I was interested in getting a letter not too long ago from one of our friends who had actually never been a professing Christian, but one of the finest people I ever could conceive of. In this letter he was commenting on a near accident that had occurred and said: "I couldn't help saying,"Thank God, though I do not believe in the supernatural." I think that I have never worried about the use of terms. Of course, in China God was the people. I think, underneath, God is watching over us all and Chinese atheists are just as much His children and in many cases are closer to Him than very many of us western professing Christians. However, don't let me preach here.

I: What did faculty and students feel was the role of a liberal arts education in a modernizing China?

SAILER: I think all through there is a tendency on the vocational. The departments of philosophy and psychology, and so forth, were very small in attraction to students. They did have a very few because students would have their own interests. But I think all through, as in western colleges, economics was very heavy. We did prepare many middle school teachers and in a course like history, which was taught heavily in middle school, there would be quite a number of majors in that department. The emphasis was always vocational. But it changed, of course, from originally how can I get a job to, after liberation, how can I serve the country best in the job to which I am assigned by the government. I really don't know; I haven't seen any statistics of different departments.

Sociology got a lot of fine idealistic students. That whole department was later simply wiped off because the government felt that western sociology dealt with social pathology. And therefore the sociologists were sent, for the most part, to the Minorities Institute, where they could use their anthropological skills.

I: What roles did students at Yenching believe intellectuals filled in a revolutionary China?

SAILER: I really don't know how students, especially, felt about it. They seemed to be as eager for education as ever, but at the same time, were willing to leave college and go and serve as Kan Pu if the government wanted them to do so. They had the intellectual tradition; they felt the country needed what they had. But they also needed to find out how to apply this usefully and to get really in touch with the masses. Of course, this has been a continuing problem right up to the present.

What I had been impressed with was the number of our colleagues who were kept right on in their own jobs or, perhaps a few like Tsai Liu Sheng in chemistry, were sent to other institutions to carry on their professional work and seem to be making a real contribution. Professor Ch'u Sheng Lin, who is again head of the Physics Department of Peking University, is a former Yenching professor. He is a very mild type and earnest Christian who, simply by his quality, has been recognized. He is certainly not the kind of man who would push himself. Professor Chao in physical education has seemed to me to make a really great contribution, but I can't really comment on all that. I do feel that our colleagues have done themselves proud. I just feel so happy about the contribution that they seem to have made and are making, even though a great many, at least, suffered a great deal in the anti-intellectual, anti-elite great time of the Cultural Revolution.

I: In looking back on your experiences, what would you have done differently?

SAILER: Certainly we had a great deal to learn. I went to China primarily with the idea that China, in spite of her tremendous and mighty civilization, was I suppose, in a sense, backward and lacked enough of modern leadership to cope with the modern world. I was going out there to try to put in my two cents worth to bring China more into the modern world (which, incidentally, is a very militaristic world, a scientific world with new thoughts of all kinds). But as I went along, I was only dimly aware that I was really missing the tremendous undercurrent surge that was going on in China, that made the new society finally come into being and erupt. I simply didn't know the significance of what was going on there.

I would have tried, if it had been possible for me at that time, to become aware of the deeper currents. I don't know what much I could have done about it. I would certainly have tried to make my psychology teaching more rigorous intellectually. I certainly would not have wanted to give up the wonderful contacts with students that we had. I would certainly have tried to get a real grasp of the language and tried to get myself into the feel of Chinese culture much better than I did. I wish that I had realized how extremely western our type of Christian faith was and had tried to develop and enlarge it by contact with other types of faiths, especially and including the Communist faith.

I: Would you please comment on your relationships with, and memorable incidents of, the following people: Leighton Stuart, Lucius Porter, Edgar Snow, Howard Galt, Han Suyin, Ida Pruitt, Wen I-to, Ralph Lapwood, Luh Yao-hua, Luh Chih-wei, Langdon Gilkey, or others.

SAILER: I could spend a great deal of time on that. Leighton Stuart was a great man because he was selfless and immensely able. It was impossible to insult him because he was fundamentally secure--secure in his Christian faith and secure in himself. He was a very, very democratic man in the sense of keeping in touch with us on the faculty, making us feel that everyone of us was a personal friend. As to students, I really used to be amused when a student crisis would come up and the faculty would discuss it. A lot of us would be hot and bothered and say the university must take a firm stand against students. Leighton, himself, would often join in that. He was in the faculty group and he could catch the spirit of the faculty. Then he would go out and talk with the student leaders and would catch their spirit.

Faculty would often accuse him of "selling us down the river" and making arrangements with students that we had not approved. But he was so much closer to students real desires and thoughts that he could go so far beyond us and held the university together and was venerated. The number of Chinese children that have been named after him, and a few foreign as well, paid tribute to that. I do think that perhaps his weakness was in not having a fundamental conception of the necessity of China having real revolution. I think that if he had gone out to Yenan himself, he would have been wonderful because he had that power of making contact with the people that he was with. On the other hand, when he was with Chiang Kai-shek and when he was a representative of the American government, he tended to think in their terms, which were not the terms which were most important to think of in China.

I got a brief note from him--I've forgotten just when--saying that there were in the '50s, certain developments that I would be interested in. I can't help wondering whether that was not some attempt he was making then to contact Communist leaders, in spite of the fact that they had denounced him. If he had been a younger man, if he had lived on, I think he could have gone back to the new China and could have used his wonderful gifts and, again, established himself in the trust of the Chinese people.

Lucius Porter was a refreshing soul. He was sometimes called the perpetual adolescent, but he was really good. When it came to Weihsien Camp, I got a new respect for Lucius--the way he took that. I first had contact with him when I took his little course. I think I have referred to his occupying John Dewey's office in Columbia the year Dewey was in China. He gave a little course with Mrs. Dewey going to sleep in the back row.

Lucius was always refreshing, but he could argue quite hotly. At times I think he thought I was a "screwball radical." On the other hand, I wrote a letter and got him to come in and maybe change it a little and sign it. We sent it off in the late '40s to the New York Times, which published it. It protested against Chiang Kai-shek's bombing and Lucius was quite delighted with that. I remember that he and I got some favors from the Communist authorities for having written that letter. Lucius said, "Here! Let's write another." Then he came back to America. He was never denounced in China because he allied himself with the pro-China groups in America. He was able and willing to speak out much more vigorously than I did. I tended to be full of qualifications which were satisfying to no one. Lucius was a great soul.

Howard Galt: Dr. Stuart the adventurer; Howard Galt the sound, steady administrator. A very kindly man and one I always had great respect for, although my temperament is more in the direction of Leighton's adventurism than Galt's conservative of holding things together. I played a great deal of tennis with Howard--he was a natural athlete and a most delightful man that you just couldn't help like and respect deeply.

Edgar Snow always appealed to me because he seemed so directly simple and honest. I felt he called them as he saw them. He was no dishonest propagandist; I felt that he never pulled punches. Of course, his trip that resulted in Red Star Over China was outstanding. We heard his first report when he came back. Snow was not an especially effective speaker because he was so unassuming and low-key, but he was a very sound man. We got to know him at Yenching.

We had the same type of friends there among radical students, but we didn't know him really well. It happened that the Snows invited us--they were living in Peking at that time--to breakfast along with the Harry Prices, as I remember, and maybe one or two others. It happened to be just at the time that the news came of Chang Hsueh-liang out in Sian having captured Chiang Kai-shek and holding him. An extremely exciting time and no one knew what would happen. Even at Yenching with its radical emphasis, this put the radicals on the defensive because it was very, very shocking to public opinion that Generalissimo, who was the symbol of the unity of the country, should actually be captured by a warlord. We didn't know if he would ever come out of it alive.

That story is very well-known, but just the excitement of being at the Snow's at that time... I think our little group welcomed that as maybe a turning point in Chinese history in which Chiang and the Communists would really get together. They didn't because Chiang continued his implacable desire to crush them. They, on the other hand, had their persistent faith that they must and could take over China in time.

When we came back to America, I met Edgar Snow, listened to his speech and, incidentally, happened to sit next to Nym Wales, the first Mrs. Snow, at that speech. Then, once we had dinner through the Edmund Clubbs (a Chinese dinner) with Edgar and his second wife. We met her at that time and all her charm; I just continued my very great admiration of Edgar Snow.

Nym Wales, the first Mrs. Snow, was a real whirlwind. She and I have kept in some touch. I saw her at the Teng Hsio-peng dinner very recently. She was as full of enthusiasm as ever. Extremely self-confident, extremely

full of ideas, but I really never followed her writing as I should have. She and Edgar were a wonderful pair, but thoroughly, in a way, incompatible. I think separation was really the only solution for them. I think Edgar acted as a thorough gentlemen, as far as I could tell, in that whole matter. Peg was just too tempestuous, although very, very dedicated. I both respected and liked her. She was very conscious of her own status as a writer and was by no means just "Mrs. Snow."

Han Suyin: I suppose I am a little influenced by her unappreciative remarks of me in her book, but I admire very much the outstanding ability. On the other hand, when I went to hear her speak in Philadelphia, I felt that she was giving too much the sort of party line on China, that she really wasn't helping us understand the very deep and difficult problems that China was dealing with. I haven't read all her books, but when I do read her, she certainly is an extremely able woman. On the whole, she has done a great deal of good in interpreting China. Some of her writings seem to be very perceptive, not just propaganda at all, so I take off my hat to her, too.

Ida Pruitt was a grand person. I saw her at the Teng dinner. She has applied for the little retirement place where we are living now. I shall enjoy her thoroughly if she comes. I think I could talk to her pretty freely now, although I have felt that she would disapprove of me as not being sufficiently near to the Chinese official positions on things, but I am not sure of that.

When I see Ida, I can talk with her, enjoy her, get along with her and certainly respect her very deeply. I didn't know her very much in Peking. She had a very good reputation there in her job. I was a little surprised at the very great leadership that she took pro-China in this country.

Wen I-to and his murder: Simply, I never knew him and I can't comment on him.

Ralph Lapwood I admired very deeply the first time I saw him. I learned a great deal from him and respected him very deeply. I think he was about the closest to us within the faculty; although, Philip Lee-Wolfe, another Britisher, I also felt very close to. I might say that when quite a prominent American wrote out to me (we happened to be old friends) and said, "Dewey will certainly be elected as President in 1948 and will appoint John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. I am very close to Dulles. Have you any comments to make from your perspective in China?" Philip Lee-Wolfe and I got together and worked pretty hard on a letter. I am afraid that we used the hackneyed phrase of "the minds and hearts of the people" and felt that they were very fundamental, that the Chiang regime was simply not getting the support of the people, not taking the kind of measures that it could.

I've forgotten just what we said. I got a real blast back from my old friend saying that was a lot of nonsense and the matter of "minds and hearts of people" isn't the way that the real world works. So I got put in my place, but this was a friend that I didn't mind arguing with later. We simply differed very fundamentally in our views. Philip Lee-Wolfe I always had respect for, but didn't know him nearly as well as I knew Ralph Lapwood. Ralph later married Nancy Stucky in Chengtu. They left Chengtu before I got out there. When we got to know Nancy, we respected her very much, too.

We have never been Oxford "groupers" but felt that Ralph did a magnificent job with that, and then, as so many people have with the Oxford Group, sort of passed beyond it. We get the Lapwood annual letters and have tremendous admiration for all they are still doing. I'd just love to have a few days of thorough talks with Ralph.

Luh Yao-hua: I just remember her as a girl in Yenching. I felt so sad when she attacked her father because she was the real apple of his eye and must have hurt him terribly. Except I was comforted lately when I was told by an old Chinese friend that C.W. really knew that his daughter, Yao-hua, did not feel that way and that she was sort of going through the motions. It sounded at the time as if she had been thoroughly imbued with the revolution and felt it was her duty to her new Communist faith to denounce her father and I still guess there is some truth in that. Knowing her father as I did, that would seem to me a great tragedy. I so earnesly hope that she was fully reconciled to him before his death.

Luh Chih-wei: I have referred to many times. C.W. was a top recognized scholar. His Ph.D. thesis was printed in a book called Great Experiments in Psychology. He was a tremendous intellect and of wide interests and a very fine personal friend. He knew that I was very second-rate intellectually, but at the same time he didn't show that and we could argue about things. I did feel, sometimes, that he was too critical of Leighton and I was very sorry that he and Stephen Tsai didn't get along better. I differed with him on things and he certainly differed with me. There is a man of tremendous integrity. Although I suppose some people would have called him anti-foreign, when the chips were down, he was the person who defended foreigners and the American connection and was attacked very heavily for doing so. He was not the kind of man who would yield his ideals to anybody.

Langdon Gilkey was another very fine intellect. He came out a short time before Pearl Harbor and had been captain of the Harvard tennis team. I did get matched up with him as his doubles partner sometimes. He was infinitely better than I was. I got to know him quite well when we

lived together in S.D. Wilson's house after Pearl Harbor. I was very much impressed with John Strachey's Nature of Capitalist Society and read it several times. It started to make sense to me as to what Communism is all about. Langdon read it and was impressed by it. We used to discuss it, so I was very close to him at that time. We had a lot of interesting discussions.

When we went down to Weihsien, we sort of parted company. I didn't see anything special of him down there. But his book, Shantung Compound, which was almost entirely about conditions after I left, was a very, very interesting piece of work. I never thought he'd be able to do as much with it as he did.

There was one time when Lang wanted to go out to the hills. I had to tell him that because of certain foot trouble that he had that the Communist authorities did not feel he ought to join the party. He took that in good nature. I think he was disappointed, but that was all dropped. He went down to Weihsien and stayed the whole way through after I was repatriated. I have seen him, I guess, only once since and had very minimum correspondence with him, but he is another man I would just love to try to catch up on.

I guess the first time I saw Hu Shih was when he came to speak to the Yenching faculty. I remember his remark at that time, saying: "I am not a Christian. But if I were, it seems to me that I would act very differently than the way that most Christians do."

I: Did Hu Shih say how he would act?

SAILER: No, he didn't, and I can't be sure just what he meant. I think he felt that we Westerners looked like a pretty well-heeled upper-class group of people who were quite a distance from the original Christians and that we were pretty well steeped in our own western culture. I really don't know just what he would have done anyway.

He was not a Christian. I don't think that to go out and sell all that he had and give to the poor would have been Hu Shih's way. He was a great intellectual leader. I think he was a very sincere man. I very much regretted his later identification with the Kuomintang. After my meeting there at Princeton, urging continued support of Yenching, he had come out against it and thought that relations with Yenching, now that it was under Communist rule, should be cut-off. I differed with him on that, but we had a friendly conversation on the train. I guess that is the only real conversation I had with him. I do feel that he was a very deep American liberal of the kind who did not really come to terms with the Chinese revolution, and I wished that he had.

Chou Tso-jen: I never knew or talked with. I knew that he taught at Yenching, but I have no comment on him.

T.T. Lew: Oh my, what a delightful and tragic man. He had tremendous intellect and was, I guess, Leighton's first prominent Chinese whom he got to join Yenching. He was very close to Leighton, very loyal to him. He was first head of the School of Religion and a very brilliant and lovable man. But, at the same time, he simply did not use his intellect in a steady way. With William Hung and T.C. Chao both coming along, who were much more disciplined, T.T. Lew tended to fall behind professionally, which was an awful shame. I don't need to comment more on him--he was a very lovable man and, I think, a very sincere Christian.

As I said, I don't think I got the significance of Wu Lei-ch'uan at all, which is brought out so well in Philip West's book. I thought of him as a great Chinese scholar, greatly respected by the Chinese, and as a great Christian, but I didn't think of him as a revolutionary--a man who really saw the deeper needs of China. If he had

been able to really take over the university, he probably wouldn't have wanted me around there. But he might have; I don't know. He would have made it a very different type of institution.

William Hung: Again a very, very great friend over many years and who's had a very tragic life. I understand now that he is cared for to a good extent by former students who were living in his house. [1]When we first went out to China (I guess I had heard his lecture in New York once or twice before that), Dick Ritter and he were good friends. The Hungs went out first class to China and Dick and Paul and I went out second class on the same ship. I remember meeting Ruth and Gertrude--his children at that time--and Rhoda, his wife, who was very charming. They had us in their home a great deal. They believed in relatively simple entertaining. I certainly don't mean unappetizing, but the Hungs had a conviction of trying to have sort of friendly family meals. We appreciated that very much.

William himself, of course, was attacked after he was dean. Then he went off in Chinese studies which was probably a good thing because he made such a big contribution in that field. I guess, almost the first night that I was down at Kuai Chia Ch'ang after my year at language school I sat up until 5:00 in the morning with William Hung, as dean, and Donald Tewksbury, as registrar, assigning the classes of students who had registered and tryingto fit them in to the very limited classroom space we had there. I was only a messenger that night, running back and forth and posting up on the board what William and Don would tell me to do. Donald Tewksbury was a wonderful guy and a great friend.

1 Since giving the above, I have heard that William is in good shape, with clear mind, and able to look after himself.

William Hung: I last saw at my 50th reunion, which was 1969, in the Kenneth Chen house in Princeton. I understand that he is still going fairly strong.

I first heard of Rewi Alley from Ralph Lapwood, who had the greatest admiration for him. Then I met him at the Lapwood home. I remember we discussed something about Atcheson's White Paper and agreed on what a tragic mistake Atcheson made, trying to appeal to Chinese liberals and, therefore, putting them on the spot. Then, when we went back in 1973, I went over to Rewi's living quarters and we had a good talk. He has sent me some of his delightful pictures of children. I have always had the greatest respect for Rewi Alley but did not know him well.

T.C. Chao was among the remarkable succession of able Chinese in the School of Religion who were great Christians with Chinese background. I think no one could come in contact with them without realizing that they had certain elements in their faith that should stimulate our faith to grow. I know that that's not at all specific and I can't really say anything more helpful.

Michael Lindsay was famous for the "jungle juice" he used to make--a kind of alcoholic drink in Yenching. He was first to come to Yenching in 1937, I think, so he had been there a year before I got back. At that time he was an outstanding liberal, or radical perhaps. Then Pearl Harbor morning I wanted to escape with him and the Bands and was packed but unable to do so. He and Hsiao Li went out to the hills and had that remarkable experience in the guerrilla areas and then at Yenan.

It was perhaps better that I didn't go and that I missed that wonderful experience since my teeth were in very bad shape--the gums. My stomach was supposed to lack hydrochloric acid. But above all, I would have been baggage, really useless in the hills, whereas Michael had great radio skills.

I do not observe, record or write well and wouldn't have been of real use there. Also, my going might have made real trouble for the household in which I was living. The Lindsays and the Bands each lived in separate houses.

Michael then went on to Chungking later and in 1950 I guess he came back. He and Hsiao Li came back on a trip to Peking and were nicely received. The government was extremely busy with other things. I understand that Michael wrote a long letter to Mao Tse-tung at that time, setting forth his ideas and hoping that the regime would stay democratic. Mao did not reply to it; it was not in tune with his thinking or with the development of things. Then, I think Michael became disillusioned. His father was a very wonderful man from all I've heard, although I've never met A.D. Lindsay.

END OF TAPE

In 1952 Michael went to Peking with the Atlee Mission and naturally was considered an expert on China and tried to help the mission out with his interpretations and his belief that it was their duty to correct Mao's thinking where he was clearly wrong, rather than to explore his thought. At least this was what Chinese in the Foreign Affairs Ministry thought, as we were told in 1973 in Peking.

I doubt that he had enough Chinese to serve as an interpreter, but he certainly stuck his oar in and I think influenced the thinking of the mission. He was very disappointed there, I guess, that he was not very warmly received in the way that he went at it. Then he wrote his book on the cold war. Re-reading that not long ago it

seems to me that his thinking became rather clear at that time and has remained along that line ever since. After his last trip to China, he wrote 30 typewritten pages of his experiences and views and gave me 10 copies of it, which I circulated among certain people.

It really shocked me. I think others looked on it more favorably than I did, but his whole approach seemed to me, the kinds of questions that he raised and his faith in argument and the faith that there was one sort of objective truth about China that could be very clearly demonstrated, simply did not appeal to me. I never met his father, but I revered him, if for nothing else, for one thing: In his little book on Karl Marx, he said when speaking on the labor theory of value: "Unless you understand the problem that a man is dealing with, you cannot understand his solution. He's not trying to solve your problem; he's trying to solve his." That made very great sense to me and always has since. I use that constantly in my thinking about China.

To me, the tragedy of Michael Lindsay, a man with very close ties with the Chinese guerrilla forces, was that he could have been a great bridge of development of understanding between America and the present Chinese government. Now, I am afraid Michael has simply thrown away that chance. I hope that he does not become sort of an embittered has-been. He has valuable insights.

Katherine Wu, the name strikes no bells with me.

Grace Boynton I had great respect for, especially her emphasis on simple living. She had very warm friends--Chinese student friends--but she was an esthete, which I certainly was not. I really had very little contact with her.

I certainly had very great respect for Hsu Pao-ch'ien, but I just have only the dimmest memory of his interest in ashrams. I never attended one and I cannot really comment.

Bliss Wiant was a great friend of ours, a good hearty soul. He did an excellent job in the music department and in the business end of the university working with Stephen Ts'ai. He had quite a flair for business. I suppose maybe that was one of our reservations on him. I think he thought in terms of property much more than I did. I very much admired his warmth with students and when he went out on the street to bargain and all that kind of thing. When I saw T.C. Chao in 1973, T.C. asked about Bliss in the very warmest way.

Luella Miner, I hardly knew her. I just met her after she retired. My sister had gone to Yenching women's college in 1921. This was just the time when there was great tension within the college as to whether Luella Miner, who represented the old order, would resign and let Mrs. Frame take over. Mrs. Frame represented much more sort of the new spirit. When Miss Miner sensed that it was time for her to retire and acknowledged that, there was just a surge of wonderful feeling toward her that went through all the staff there. Then she retired very gracefully.

Mrs. Frame was a real dynamo. She took a little dim view of anybody who came around and showed interest in running off with one of her women's college faculty. Of course, I fell in that category. She was a very able person and was very highly respected.

Dwight Edwards--a father-in-law of Brank Fulton, to whom I have been so close. Dwight was a great YMCA man whose emphasis was on developing Chinese leadership. He himself was a very able administrator in famine relief and

that kind of thing. He did a mighty work. You just think of the word 'solid' in connection with him. He was the kind of man who had the confidence of everyone and had excellent Chinese and was greatly respected by government officials. Actually he sort of acted for Leighton Stuart at Yenching, didn't he, just before and after Pearl Harbor? I really don't remember just what happened about that.

As I listen back to these tapes I am very much struck with how muddled and inadequate my answers are to the various questions posed. It seems to me that the questions are very well chosen on the whole. Let me make a few supplements.

In my background, I spoke of interest in China, but I also early developed a very deep concern with the inequalities in the world. There is a little, perhaps sentimental, story that I read as a boy--a story of a little southern white girl, sharecropper, who never got the shoes that she longed for. That I've always remembered. It affected me very deeply. When I went to college, I still had this feeling of sort of hatred or disgust with privilege. Our family was privileged. We weren't rich, but we were privileged economically. We had more, certainly much more, than the average person at that time. My father had a very strong sense of social responsibility, but we did live on a scale that was far above the average. Then, I've already mentioned my experience in Princeton Camp and really getting around the tenements and talking with parents there and seeing how the boys lived and getting such a warm affection from them.

During my college course, I remember going to one conference of the Inter-Collegiate Socialist Society--a very small organization. My sister came down from Vassar and she and I were, I think, the only college students there.

Harry Laidler, I think, ran the conference for the Inter-Collegiate Socialist Society. There were people like Roger Baldwin, Gregory Zilborg, A. J. Muste, and so on, who argued very hotly and presented very different points of view. This was so different from a religious conference where everybody had the same line of thought and supported each other. Here you had a great deal of fellowship and earnest desire for a new society, but a great deal of controversy as to how it should be brought about. I found that extremely appealing, but I didn't really follow it up. It does show, though, that I had a strong interest along that line.

As to China, my father, mother and older sister took a year's trip out to China during my freshman year at college. I stayed and studied and majored in history and politics with a minor in economics, but I don't think that had anything to do with China. It was a really good, broad and shallow education. But in economics, I got more interested in that. I debated on the Princeton team and our topics tended to have relation to economics. I found deep interest in economic questions and that tied in, I suppose, with the desire for a better society. When I was a kid, I remember my father reading aloud Looking Backward to us. I suppose I have always had a sort of utopian streak in me.

In China, as I mentioned before, there was a great emphasis on simple living. This was something that we agonized over because we knew we were living so far above the level of the country. I remember lying in a warm bed at night in Yenching and knowing that within a mile of me, there were a lot of people who were really suffering from the cold. Yet we had warm blankets and probably had extra blankets we could have piled on. Yet we talked about love that we were not implementing. I sort of rebelled against the way that I was, myself, living there, but I didn't do anything effective about it.

There were certainly Chinese students who felt the same kind of thing. They knew how to live simply and they were concerned. They could live on a very much simpler basis and were happy in doing so, more than American students could.

When we went back in 1973, we were almost, I think, the first missionaries, possibly the first American missionaries, to go back. I, of course, listed myself as a Christian on the application blank, but I rather deliberately did not inquire into Christian work in China because I didn't want to give the impression that we were primarily interested in the old type of Christianity as they knew it, rather than in the whole thrust of the new China.

We made it our policy to listen. Looking back on it now, I think I could have probably learned much more if I had done a certain type of questioning, but I was very conscious of the fact that we were among the first. We didn't want to do anything that would make the Chinese feel that if these Christians come over, they are likely to pry. We wanted very much to smooth the way for any that would come later. Those that did come later, people like Don MacInnis, learned a <u>great</u> deal more than we did. I think we emphasized taking up the warmth of former relationships.

Another word on the fellowship groups. I think that this might be a model for the indigenous church in emphasizing fellowship groups, rather than on general church attendance and listening to a minister. We did have these services, one in English and one in Chinese at Yenching. There were some very fine Chinese preachers. The Chinese service was not well attended; that was not the form of expression of religion that came naturally to Chinese. Perhaps they were much closer to the early Christians than we were.

As to foreigners outside Yenching, I should certainly have mentioned the ones we saw most often--the other members of our mission--the North China Mission of the Presbyterian Church. We had warm friends among them. Gradually, they changed their attitude toward Yenching. I think, before we were finished, they became proud of it and rather depended on it. (In Weihsien we had really very warm friends among them, too.) Sometimes missionaries sent their children to Yenching for one or two years. Some of them have been outstanding: Mrs. Ruth Wiley Zimmerman for one, and others as well.

I: How did western students fare at Yenching? How involved in student activities were they able to get?

SAILER: I think this question should have been asked of western students themselves. I think they varied. I think in general they tended to come to Yenching for studies. They were often very, very friendly with their fellow students, but I think perhaps felt a little bit apart from them. I wouldn't say any one of them became a student leader.

Communists in the spring of '26 when the Northern Expedition had started, some people in Yenching had sort of visions of Communists rushing our gates. There were some rather ridiculous things that happened that I don't think I'll tell. Some of the men went up to the women's college to guard that at night. J. B. Tayler, the mildest man in the world and a great intellect, was there on guard at the women's college. Almost a feather would have blown him over, but there was that spirit of apprehension as to what was going to happen and whether people were going to break into Yenching--not quite as strong a test as murder-assault, but there was some of that fear, too.

I spoke of the great changes in attitudes toward sex while we were there. The fact that the women's college and the men's college were together on the same campus had a great deal to do with that. At first, there was a women's college classroom building--Sage Hall. In general, it was expected that many of the classes would be separate, that women would have their own English classes. Where the classes were large enough, they were to be separate. But, believe me, that broke down very rapidly. Classes were simply indiscriminate all through the university.

I: Here are a few additional questions that came to mind: What contribution did China have to make through Yenching to the West? What were the Chinese contributions to Christianity and the West?

SAILER: This is a tough and very comprehensive question. I think Yenching, through intimate fellowship between Westerners and extremely intelligent and dedicated Chinese, offered a chance for developing a really deep understanding. I think some of that did come out in various publications, though I am certainly not familiar with many of them.

I: What role did Yenching students play in the December Ninth Movement of 1935?

SAILER: This, I think, was the high point of Yenching leadership in the students' movement. At times students at different universities would take leadership. At this particular time Yenching was sufficiently perhaps protected from the government for students to play a big part. We had some very able student leaders there just at that time: the Kung sisters and Wang Ju Mui and many others I could mention.

I: What was the faculty's response to Walter Judd's visit to China in 1947 and his views?

SAILER: I think Walter Judd's part in stirring up America against the Japanese attack on China had been very much appreciated. When it came around to Communism, I think he was looked upon as an extremist, perhaps something of a nut. I just don't think he had any special impact on our faculty as far as I know. I remember having a brief talk with him in the president's office. Walter was not a very good person to listen and find out. I got the impression he was much more interested in pushing his own ideas.

I: Would you give illustrations of what you meant by a 'freedom of silence' after the turnover?

SAILER: I think that I was wrong on this freedom of silence. I think that as far as my particular experience went, I had it. I remember a Chinese colleague saying, "Would you care to make a statement on the new regime that could be published, a statement of sympathy?" And I said, "Really, I don't feel I can." That was accepted in perfectly good faith. I was never pressed for my views, but increasingly I think Chinese were. I didn't realize the pressures on them.

I: Was Yenching able to serve as a mediator between China and the West?

SAILER: To a certain extent. Leighton Stuart, if he had not been ambassador, might have played a tremendously significant role. I don't know. The China lobby was so strong at that time and the whole current of things in America with McCarthyism about to take over might have made it impossible

and merely discredited him. At least, if he had kept up his warm contacts in China with the members of the new government and then had gradually kept reporting to the State Department, I think he would have been a very great help, but the department itself might not have listened to him.

I: What commentary does the Yenching experience provide about the possibility of meaningful Sino-western relations?

SAILER: I hate to keep on talking in terms of Yenching as though this is anything very special among the Christian colleges. I think that in general, and not just in Christian colleges, with all associations between Chinese and Westerners, deep personal friendships grew up and were invaluable, and a great deal of understanding. Students played a much more significant part in China than they did in America. They were much more respected. They were much more influential in the development of the country. Therefore, an educational institution offered a very special possibility for a development of relationships. It was unofficial. It was not government. Where it was suspected of sort of being an agent of the U.S. government, that would very, very much limit its effectiveness.

It was the Yenching Chinese studies that made an impression on Chinese studies in a way that had never been done before. People like William Hung, I think, greatly helped to make China a very real place of study and understanding. John Fairbank was one of the students who came out from America as a young man and became a Harvard-Yenching scholar there. Yenching had that kind of climate when Edgar Snow settled there for a time and taught in the department of journalism. Yenching offered all kinds of very wonderful possibilities, some of which were taken adequate advantage of and some were not.

Now to do a little philosophizing. Sam Dean, I mentioned him before, was a very practical engineer in our mission who scorned university students until he actually came to Yenching later and was pleasantly surprised there. Sam Dean had a principle that I have always remembered. He said so often we look around for Chinese who are unemployed and don't have anything to do. We try to sort of try to build them up and give them something to do. He said that a more effective way is to look around and see who is doing a good job now and then try to help them to do it better. Their influence in the long run would accomplish more. Well, I thought of that as Sam Dean's Principle, and I think it is, in general, a very sound one.

Since 1973 I've been thinking over China. I'm not a writer; I don't write easily. I have made talks and tried to arouse discussion, but finally it came to me that I would try to work on a pamphlet. I got my good friend, Brank Fulton of Yale-in-China, to agree to put his name to it, too; although, he left practically all the writing to me with some comments from him. It came out after a trial edition as "Ten Suggestions for Working to Understand China and America Better." It has been very far from a huge literary success, although some people, I think, and some people I care about, have really felt that it had some good, solid stuff in it.

Originally, it was intended to try to make people think about both China and America and to think in terms of comparison of China and America <u>without judgment</u>, which is very hard for Americans to do. In the first place, we say, "Oh China, that's a tremendous subject. How can we think about America, too? That is ridiculous. Or, if we do think about America, we are going to differ in our views and we don't want to get to squabbling about that."

I feel that we cannot understand China unless we study America at the same time. To stand off and try to be a China expert and mastermind China, to describe China without realizing that I am seeing China through American eyes is hopeless. This is the point of view that Brank and I stressed in this little pamphlet. After it was done, after it came out and these opportunities for contact between Chinese of the PRC and Americans began to be developed, I went to the pamphlet again.

It seemed to me that it would form the basis of a really possible approach to cooperative thinking between Chinese and Americans. That's what I am especially interested in now and have a very few beginning chances to develop. It seems to be going well. Our central thesis is that if we discuss solutions, we argue. If we discuss problems, we can think together, each contributing his or her perspective.

It is essential to think together about both societies, both their similarities and differences. Differences are more obvious but the similarities are more important and harder to see; we can be thinking together with Chinese, both about our society and Chinese society. However, my experience is that this simply does not commend itself to the average American, or many Americans at all, who think in terms of how can we get a balanced view about China. Of course, we know our own country and we don't need to consider that. I suppose I will spend the rest of my life trying, in my small way, to tilt against that, but I don't expect to have much success.

Now for some last licks! I've referred several times in these recordings to my wish that I had been intellectually harder-headed, more responsible, that I had not sort of gone off into superficial "trying to make things relevant" to students when I really didn't have the intellectual understanding to do so. But I am glad that I tried as much as I did. I was very interested in anthropology--Margaret Mead, etc. I was interested to the extent which Veblen's "theory of the leisure class" seemed to apply to Chinese society, although Veblen never mentioned China at all.

But since I left China in 1950, I got hold of tools that I could have worked so much more effectively with. I just wish I had them before. One of them was Carl Rogers. I spent a year in 1952-1953 training out in his counseling center in Chicago, on how to understand the feelings of another person. My own emphasis was much more on intercultural. His was sort of on actualization of the self which never meant, I am afraid, too much to me. His general method was trying persistently to find out what another person is feeling and to show that you know what another person is feeling.

I think this was very, very valuable. I could have made much more use of it in China. Actually, I had made a little use of this approach before I left in 1950 when I sat down with a Communist friend and said, "Won't you let me explain how I sense you feel about Communism. Then, won't you correct me and show me where I am wrong." So we did that for a little while. I made my statement. He said, "Yes, I think you've got a lot of it, but..." Then he gave me valuable insights through the 'but...' That was one tiny little effort at that kind of thing that I wish I had done a lot more fully.

The other thing that I picked up was the technique at role-playing which is now very old hat in America. I think I could have made such good use of it in mutually getting my students and I myself to understand better how the different Chinese tend to react in a certain situation as compared with Americans. I think it would have been most valuable if I could have used role-playing a great deal to enlarge my insights.

There are three books that have influenced my thinking very, very much. I wish that they had been written earlier and I had been able to discuss them with students and colleagues. One was Francis L.K. Hsu's, Americans and Chinese, in which he compared and contrasted the two cultures in many ways. It really didn't hit me hard until I read the 1970 revised edition. I don't agree with it by any means wholly, especially his statement that he feels that America was more congenial to Communism than China was. I won't go into that now. I think maybe after visiting China and becoming much more favorable to the regime, he would modify that judgment himself. This was an extremely insightful book.

The second is Fitzgerald's Fire In the Lake on Viet Nam. This is a most remarkable intellectual feat by that young woman who had such comparatively little background writing that book. The first 40 pages of her insights seem to me very, very stimulating, especially in the contrast between the American individual self and the Chinese self. She was speaking of the Chinese and of the Confucian tradition. The other point, not quite so vivid, was the Chinese search for one way of life. Those two points seem to me to make an awful lot of sense to help illumine the contrast between China and America to me.

The third book is one that I absolutely swear by and I have gotten an awful lot from it. There is practically no mention of China. Hamry B. Parkes' The American Experience. This is a little Vintage paperback that I picked up for 10 cents in the early '70s in a church book sale. I read it several times. I have found only one other person who has read it. I lent it to him, as a matter of fact, and he was fascinated by it, too. I just haven't found that other people have read it. It is not in our county library list at all. I swear by my copy. It is a history of American traditions, the way that our value system developed under very different conditions from those that hold at present and how these value systems tend to lag behind changes in actual institutions. I won't say more about that now except to say that it has been an extremely influential book in my own thought and in helping me to see the contrast that he draws between American and certain European traditions. I think it could be drawn much more clearly between American and the present Chinese way of going about these. So much for those books.

Now, how about the place of psychology in China now. The Chinese, of course, have been great applied psychologists. Mao had his definite theory of human nature and Chinese Communists operate on certain very definite assumptions. We Americans operate on very definite assumptions, too, and we are not likely to look into our assumptions nor are the Chinese. I hope that the interaction between Chinese and Americans now can take the form a good deal of you might say psychological thinking. Certainly not in a classic sense, but in an effort to understand each other and at the same time, equally important, to understand ourselves.

Such things as our value system, how it grew up, how it persists and what might make it change. Going back to John Dewey and his human nature and conduct, he says people often say that instincts are fixed and habits are very flexible. He says actually the opposite is true: Instincts lend themselves to many forms of expression but habits are hard to change. I would like to follow through on that thought. It is very hard to compare the traditions of two cultures and to go into them and especially to look for assumptions rather than conclusions. It is so easy to think deductively. I think Chinese tend to think deductively based on certain Marxist principles. We Americans consider ourselves much more open-minded, but I think we too almost always tend to begin with general principles and then to apply them, rather than going at questions from the standpoint of "Yes, I feel this way about it and you feel this way about it. Why?", and varying our feelings rather than saying, "Let's agree on principles first and then deduce from that."

Within China today and in America, if Chinese and Americans could just discuss together general questions of incentives and motivation, the relation between seeking for wealth and seeking for power, care for family, and so forth. Actually, how do incentives work out in the two societies, not how they ought to work out, but let's begin with how they do work out. How about a status society versus a competitive society. Of course, all societies are mixed to this extent and I think that there seems to be a very strong sense of status and its prerequisites in China.

We Americans are under the illusion that we have gotten away from that, but certainly there is a lot of that here. The relation between competition and cooperation. What is

the real meaning of socialist competition, individual differences, assumptions of human nature, and so forth? These questions are so pressingly important. We can gain so much if we combine American and Chinese perspectives and don't begin with our assumptions which we don't get really out in the open and then try to apply them to China.

How can we encourage productive thinking? In my mind, not by making judgments, not by comparing and evaluating solutions, not by masterminding China or concentrating on trying to give fair and balanced analyses of China because that simply omits the fact that we are seeing China through American eyes; not through giving advice, not through confrontation or argument, scorecard judging, handing out brownie points for each of the two societies according to a pre-accepted scale of values--but by looking into our scales of values. On what basis are we really judging and just trying to understand the other person in our conversations? Constantly avoiding saying, "This is right. This is wrong." But saying, "It seems to me," and "As I understand it, it seems to you...." It seems to me that if we can develop that kind of cooperative thinking, both cultures can profit tremendously from that sort of attempt at cooperative thinking and analysis of our common values.

ADDENDUM

This enclosed snapshot is of a baptism of some thousand of General Feng Yu-hsiang's soldiers in the South City of Peking, perhaps the Temple of Heaven grounds, during my first year in China, 1923-4. The story has been repeatedly told with glee, by Melby, my good friend James Thomson of Harvard, and others, that General Feng has his troops baptized with a garden hose. I cannot absolutely deny that as to other occasions, and it may have been that water used in a baptism came from a receptacle filled by a hose. But I can solemnly testify that this particular mass baptism was carried out in a spirit of reverence by a group of Chinese and western missionary pastors. A visiting church dignitary from America gave an address that seemed to me very flowery, with metaphors impossible to translate, but I am told that the Chinese Methodist pastor who did translate did a remarkable job.

General Feng was a warlord and was castigated by many for marching back and taking Peking when he was allied with Wu Pei Fu and had gone north to support Wu against Chang Tso-lin, warlord of Manchuria. He was no saint, but I think the hose story ought to be challenged as to authenticity, and proof asked to be produced. At least his troops had the reputation of acting better than those of other warlords, no great praise, and my impression is that he was a sincere Christian convert. What it meant to the soldiers

whose conversion was arranged, ordered by him can be thought of as very doubtful. My impression is that it meant "Five Don'ts;" perhaps "Don't steal, swear, fornicate, gamble, lie and oppress the people." Pretty negative, but, of course, Feng's example was the main thing. Feng remained a dissident, and revolted against Chiang in 1929-'30, and later joined the Communist Revolution. He died in a shipboard fire under circumstances I don't think have been clarified.

It seems to me the hose story goes along too easily with a somewhat condenscending dèriding of Chinese Christians who did not meet western standards (I wonder about Charlemagne) and of the gullibility of missionaries in accepting him as a convert.

The missionary who took me to the baptism was Rev. LeRoy Johnson of the Presbyterian Mission, a jolly as well as devout man, and he was one of the baptizers.

No acknowledgement needed.

Sincerely,

Randolph Sailer